DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 024 CG 025 372

AUTHOR	Mecartney, Crystal A.; And Others
TITLE	Mentoring in the Juvenile Justice System: Findings from Two Pilot Programs.
INSTITUTION	Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.; Retirement Research Foundation.
PUB DATE	Jan 94
NOTE	94p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Public/Private Ventures, One Commerce Square, 2005 Market Street, Suite 900, Philadelphia, PA 19103.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Delinquent Rehabilitation; Disadvantaged Environment; Disadvantaged Youth; Juvenile Courts; *Mentors; Role Models; Secondary Education; Significant Others; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Georgia (Atlanta); Missouri (Saint Louis)

ABSTRACT

This study examined two pilot mentoring programs which were designed to provide information on the feasibility of integrating mentoring relationships into the juvenile justice system. Each program, one in St. Louis, Missouri and one in Atlanta, Georgia, sought to recruit, train, and match 100 adult volunteers (half over the age of 55) with 100 adjudicated youths. Neither site achieved the targeted 100 matches. Interviews with program staff and participants suggest that the number of youth wanting a mentor exceeded the number of volunteers. The report profiles the adolescents, the correlations of delinquency, and the importance of social support in young lives. Also presented are the recruiting, training, and matching of mentors as well as evaluations and characteristics of the mentor/adolescent matches. Among the conclusions, it is believed that such mentoring programs would be feasible if systems could devote significant staff resources to recruiting, screening, training, and supervising the mentor, in addition to overseeing the mentor/youth relationship. The study includes an appendix on methodology, and 13 tables which display data sources, the characteristics of the matches, reasons for termination, and other information. Contains 36 references. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Public/Private Ventures

P/PV

ED 369 024

Mentoring in the Juvenile Justice System:

Findings from Two Pilot Programs

by Crystal A. Mecartney
Melanie B. Styles
Kristine V. Morrow

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG025372

Winter 1994

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Jaffe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Public/Private Ventures is a national, not-for-profit corporation that designs, manages, and evaluates social policy initiatives aimed at helping young people whose lack of preparation for the work force hampers their chances for productive lives. P/PV's work is supported by funds from both the public and private sectors.

Rex D. Adams
Chairman of the Board

Michael A. Bailin
President

Gary Walker
Executive Vice President

Board of Directors

Rex D. Adams
William R. Anton
Michael A. Bailin
Douglas J. Besharov
Angela Glover Blackwell
Roy J. Bostock
Alan K. Campbell
Alice F. Emerson
Mitchell S. Fromstein
David W. Hornbeck
Harold Howe II
Siobhan Oppenheimer-Nicolau
John W. Porter
Harold Richman
Eddie N. Williams

Research Advisory Committee

Frank Furstenberg
Robinson Hollister
Henry Levin
Frank Levy
Anita Summers
Marta Tienda

Corporate Associates

American Express Foundation
Ameritech Foundation
ARA Services, Inc.
Bank of Boston
Borden, Inc.
CIGNA Foundation
Comcast Corporation
Coopers & Lybrand
D'Arcy Masius Benton and Bowles, Inc.
Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.
Exxon Corporation
IBM Corporation
Mobil Foundation, Inc.
Prudential Foundation

Public/Private Ventures
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 900
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215/557-4400

P/PV

Mentoring in the Juvenile Justice System:

Findings from Two Pilot Programs

by Crystal A. Mecartney
Melanie B. Styles
Kristine V. Morrow

Winter 1994

4

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Adult/Youth Relationships Pilot Project implementation and research were funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, The Pinkerton Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, The Retirement Research Foundation, and The Skillman Foundation. We wish to thank them all for their generous support.

This report would not have been possible without the talents and hard work of many P/PV staff members. In particular, we wish to thank Alvia Branch and Jeffrey Greim for their input into all phases of the research effort. Michelle Alberti Gambone, Natalie Jaffe, Gary Walker and Bernardine Watson also provided insightful comments on drafts of this report.

Cynthia Sipe provided guidance in the early phase of this research effort. Russell Jackson of Decision Information Resources was instrumental in documenting the program's implementation. Also assisting in data collection were P/PV staffers Jeanine Ford, Julita Milliner, Amy Jordan, Anabel Aportela, Colin Rajah and Andrew Cohen. On-site research assistants Ben McIver and Rhonda Burgett helped coordinate the research effort and collect baseline data.

Angela Everman performed the computer programming; Batia Trietsch and Eleanor Hammond prepared the data for analysis. Susan Tomko transcribed the interviews, and Jenifer Marquis and Maxine Sherman processed the final drafts. Michael Callaghan was responsible for copy editing, and Robert Henry produced the tables.

Work on the project was aided by advice from P/PV's Adult/Youth Relationships Advisory Board members: Richard Danzig of Latham and Watkins, Ronald Ferguson of Harvard University, Frank Furstenberg of the University of Pennsylvania, Beatrix Hamburg of The William T. Grant Foundation, Harold Howe II of Harvard University, Joan Schine of the Early Adolescent Helper Program, Heather Weiss of Harvard University, and Emmy Werner of the University of California, Davis.

We especially wish to thank staff of the Missouri Division of Children and Youth Services (MDCYS), the Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services (GDCYS) and the Southeast Regional Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), who made significant contributions to the research effort by both collecting mentor logs and speaking to us at length about their experiences operating these mentoring programs. Special thanks go to Troy Miles, Lewis Mueller and Pat Doyen of MDCYS, Jaci Vickers and Phyllis Elbert of GDCYS, and Earl Shinhoster and Garnett Brown of the NAACP. Finally, we are deeply indebted to the youth and mentors who willingly completed numerous questionnaires, mentor logs and interviews so that we could learn from their experiences.

CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

I. INTRODUCTION 1
  Project Background 2
  Two Participating Sites 3
  The Program Model 6
  Research 7
  Methodology 7
  Data Sources 8

II. PARTICIPATING YOUTH 13
  Profiles of Participating Youth 13
  The Correlates of Delinquency 15
  The Importance of Social Support 19

III. RECRUITMENT AND MATCHING 21
  Recruitment 21
  Mentor Characteristics 25
  Training 28
  Matching 28

IV. EVALUATING IMPLEMENTATION 33
  Frequency of Meeting and Length of Match 33
  Facility-Based Matches 37
  Transitioned and Community-Based Matches 44
  Participants' and Staff Members' Views of the Program 50
  Benefits to the System 53

V. CHARACTERISTICS OF SUSTAINED MATCHES 55
  Characteristics of Supportive Adults and Peers 55
  Effective Patterns of Interaction 57

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 65
  Recruitment 65
  Training 66
  Matching 66
  Supervision 66
  Challenges of the System 67
  Recommendations 68

REFERENCES 71

APPENDIX: METHODOLOGY A-1

TABLES

Page

1. DATA SOURCES 9
2. YOUTH CHARACTERISTICS 14
3. MENTOR CHARACTERISTICS 26
4. LENGTH OF MATCH BY FREQUENCY OF MEETING - ALL MATCHES 34
5. LENGTH OF MATCH BY FREQUENCY OF MEETING - SITE BREAKDOWN 35
6. REASONS MATCHES TERMINATED 38

A-1. CRONBACH'S ALPHA FOR YOUTH SCALES A-8

A-2. YOUTH BASELINE SCORES AND CHANGE AT FOLLOW-UP A-9

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Policymakers, practitioners and researchers agree that youth need positive, consistent relationships with adults to support their development. In high-risk communities, a dearth of such relationships in neighborhoods and basic institutions, and even in families, has been identified as a factor contributing to young people's difficulties in pursuing a constructive life path. Thus, interest in mentoring has grown over the past decade. Hundreds of small programs have been established to form relationships between youth in need of guidance and adults with the time and interest to forge constructive bonds with them.

P/PV has been exploring the usefulness and viability of mentoring as an intervention since 1988, when we conducted a study of five small projects that matched retired men and women with young people in need of supportive relationships. The study found that strong relationships were formed by a significant number of pairs; that the elders who volunteered were highly receptive to undertaking stimulating and productive activity; and that the youth, often in crisis and without much adult support or involvement in their lives, welcomed the elders' interest. These findings were corroborated by P/PV's 1992 study of four intergenerational programs developed by Temple University's Center for Intergenerational Learning. In both studies, approximately two-thirds of the matches were classified as effective, meaning that the youth and adult met regularly and established reciprocal bonds.

Through these and other studies of mentoring programs involving college students and local Big Brothers/Big Sisters agencies, P/PV has begun to identify the styles of youth/adult interaction most likely to lead to regular meetings and constructive bonds, and the agency practices most likely to support the constructive interaction that could generate measurable benefits for the youth.

At the same time, P/PV is interested in addressing the public policy-related questions that arise from current interest in mentoring: can supportive adult relationships be made available on a regular basis to the large numbers of youth in programs that receive public funds? Can mentoring be added to existing public services in ways that will not strain increasingly tight program budgets; will extend the services provided by existing staff without adding to their burdens; and will enrich the institution's services so as to increase its benefits to youth?

To address these questions, P/PV chose to pilot a mentoring model designed to bridge a youth's incarceration in a juvenile justice institution and his/her discharge to the community. Although the more than one million youth adjudicated each year to the juvenile justice system have problems that are notably difficult to address, this system was chosen for the pilot because the young people are in special need of help in making the transition from institutional to community life; and the system itself is looking for ways to improve programming, particularly in the community, and was therefore receptive to the introduction of mentoring.

With funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts, The Pinkerton Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, The Retirement Research Foundation and The Skillman Foundation, P/PV conducted the pilot from October 1991 through June 1993 in juvenile justice facilities located in Atlanta and St. Louis.

The St. Louis program, which involved five residential facilities, was run by the Missouri Division of Children and Youth Services. The Atlanta program, which involved one residential facility and a variety of nonresidential community-based programs, was operated by the Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services and the Southeast Regional Office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). In each of the two sites, the only new staff designated was a project director responsible for overall management of the mentoring program. Supervision of the matches was dispersed to the mentees' individual caseworkers, both in facility- and community-based programming. P/PV provided extensive technical assistance to the agencies as they set up and operated the program.

The research included documentation of start-up, recruitment and operations, as well as collection and analysis of baseline and follow-up questionnaires administered to all mentors and youth; weekly mentor logs that recorded adult/youth interactions; interviews with mentors, youth and agency personnel, including semistructured interviews with members of 42 matches (mentors and youth were interviewed separately); recorded observations of training sessions; and youth's case files and program records.

Overall, the findings from this research are consistent with those of other mentoring programs P/PV has assessed: without a structure dedicated to training, supporting and supervising the functioning of mentors, the program could not meet its goals. Because such large public systems are typically constrained by limited budgets, the project design did not require sites to allocate additional resources. The youth's caseworkers were asked to add supervision of the matches to their already considerable responsibilities. In the absence of full-time supervision, slightly more than one-fourth of the institution-based matches met regularly for six months or more, and few continued to meet after the youth was discharged to the community. Less than one-fourth of those established in community-based programs met often enough to establish reciprocal bonds. In addition, the unique demands of the institution and the youth population it serves, compounded with limited resources, made implementation issues difficult to address effectively.

Given this experience and the research findings, we conclude that significant change in the system--including the allocation of additional staff resources, flexibility in working with volunteers, and an aftercare system to provide other needed services--would be required to integrate mentoring programs effectively.

THE MATCHES

Adult volunteers were asked to make a one-year commitment to meet weekly with their youth. Analyses of mentor logs, survey data and program records for 157 of the 163 project matches indicate that nearly half (42%) met less than twice a month, and the majority (62%) lasted six months or less. Only 41 matches (26%) met regularly (at least twice a month) for more than six months, lower than the rates P/PV has found in other mentoring programs.

Comparing the matches that originated in a juvenile justice facility with those that originated in community-based programs, we found that half the facility-based matches met regularly over the course of the relationship, while only 8 percent of the community-based matches did so. As for matches that bridged the youth's discharge, 45 made the transition from institution to community, but only 11 (10% of all facility-based matches) continued to meet regularly.

In both the facility and the community, matches encountered problems that interfered with their ability to meet. Facility rules limited the activities available to mentors and youth, and the time during which they could meet. Many relationships ended before the youth was released because the mentor left the program.

Nevertheless, most youth said they valued the mentors' efforts. While youth were incarcerated, mentors offered welcome opportunities to escape temporarily the tedium of institutional life. For some youth, the mentor was the only person who visited on a regular basis. And, as noted earlier, about one-fourth of the pairs did achieve a sustained relationship.

Interviews with participants in both sustained and discontinued matches disclosed the following characteristics of mentor behavior in sustained matches: the mentors understood the importance of consistency (keeping appointments and being supportive "no matter what"); the mentor stayed focused on the youth in providing help, particularly in intervening on the youth's behalf and offering advice that the youth appreciated; and the mentor interacted with the youth's family. These characteristics are those the youth reported valuing in all their relationships.

Although most matches that transitioned to the community had met regularly while in the facility, their difficulties in meeting outside were similar to those faced by community-based matches: lack of aftercare and supervision, frequent changes in residence, no telephone, and problems with the law that resulted in reincarceration. Facility-based matches were most likely not to meet because the mentor was too busy, out of town, ill or had transportation problems; in the community, the cause of not meeting was more likely to be attributable to the youth--they were either too busy, could not be found, had run away or had been sent to an institution.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

The project was designed to determine whether 100 adult volunteers in each program (half of whom would be over the age of 55) could be recruited, trained and matched with 100 adjudicated youth; whether supervision of these matches could be dispersed to individual caseworkers; and whether these adult volunteers could facilitate both the youth's treatment while incarcerated and their return to their communities on release.

Recruitment

Neither site was successful in reaching the target of 100 matches. Recruiting mentors for this population was both time-consuming and difficult, partly because juvenile justice institutions have, traditionally, few connections with the public and community institutions that could be used for outreach. The demand exceeded the supply: many more youth wanted mentors than there were mentors available to be matched.

The sites did have relative success in recruiting black men, a group that other mentoring programs report limited success in attracting. This success can be attributed to the targeted recruitment strategies employed, and, in Atlanta, to the name recognition of the NAACP, which managed the recruitment effort there.

Neither site was able to attract a sufficient number of elders, whose mentoring performance was to have been compared with that of non-elders. Therefore, this part of the project's research agenda could not be pursued.

Interviews with program staff and elder-serving organizations indicate that the recruitment of elders requires different strategies than those used to attract non-elders, since few elders came forward in response to either general recruitment efforts or efforts targeting black volunteers. Recruiting through elder organizations and churches with whom recruiters established personal relationships appeared to be the most successful approach. Deterrents to elder recruitment included agency staff concern about their effectiveness with young offenders, the elder organizations' fears about their members' contact with these youth, the lack of public transportation to the institutions and elders' need for stipends, which were not introduced until halfway through the project.

Training

The majority of mentors attended at least one training session, but felt training would have been more helpful if it included specific information about their youth--his or her home situation, reason for adjudication and treatment plan--and the rules and regulations of the facility. A lack of concrete information is a common complaint of adult volunteers in other mentoring programs as well.

Matching

Consistent with the matching process of other programs P/PV has examined, the two pilot programs matched youth and mentors based on common interests and the youth's particular needs (for a strong male or female role model). Due to the complexities and structure of the juvenile justice system, however, the matching process proved to be time-consuming and complicated. Caseworkers were centrally involved, and the demands of their caseloads slowed the matching process to the point that some volunteers were never matched.

The sites were willing to make matches in which the race and gender of mentors and youth were different, since allowing cross-gender and cross-race matches yielded greater flexibility in matching and allowed more youth to be matched. The research found no differences between same- and cross-race matches, nor between same- and cross-gender matches, in terms of their consistency, demonstrated support and caring.

Supervision

Interviews with staff and mentors indicate that the responsibility for supervising mentoring cannot be grafted onto existing staff job responsibilities. Not only did staff's workloads preclude consistent attention to mentors' needs, staff felt they had no authority over the mentors and were thus reluctant to contact those who failed to show up.

The large number of matches that failed to meet consistently or last longer than six months attests to the problems inherent in this supervisory structure. Good intentions on the part of volunteers are not sufficient. Given the competing demands on their time, adult volunteers need consistent reminders and encouragement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Adding mentoring to juvenile justice programming may be feasible, but only if systems can devote significant staff resources to recruiting, screening, training and supervising the mentors, and to facilitating their interactions with the young people. That would require changes in institutional practices and additional costs.

To systems that are willing to devote resources to a mentoring program, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Increase the number of volunteers gradually so they can familiarize themselves with the system and help new volunteers do so without overburdening professional staff.

2. Screen out adults who have overcommitted their time. If adults are too busy to maintain their visiting schedule, the potential damage to youth as they are abandoned by yet another adult may be greater than any potential benefits.

3. Increase the length, content and practicality of training. In addition to providing information on the institution and the assigned youth, training should cover appropriate expectations for the relationship, and emphasize that it is the responsibility of the adult in the relationship to contact the youth, and not vice versa.

4. Provide consistent supervision and support to volunteers as functions separate from those of staff with regular caseloads. Programs with staff specially assigned to supervise volunteers tend to produce matches that meet regularly and endure.

5. Adjust institutional rules to allow the pairs--as much as is consistent with security--more privacy for their meetings, more options for activities and more flexibility in meeting times.

6. Assign volunteers to youth in the community only as part of an established aftercare program. With mentoring as part of an aftercare program that involves regular contact with a caseworker, and such services as family and individual counseling, vocational training, GED classes and recreational activities, relationships will continue to have a programmatic base for meeting and may last longer.

While youth need caring, supportive adults in their lives, mentoring alone cannot substitute for comprehensive programming delivered by trained professionals. If adjudicated youth are to become responsible adults, they need comprehensive services--not only in the institution, but upon their return to the community.

I. INTRODUCTION

Practitioners and policymakers have long grappled with designing and implementing interventions to help at-risk youth overcome adversity and achieve their potential as responsible adults. The need for such intervention is great. Approximately one in four of the 28 million Americans aged 10 to 17 are at high risk of engaging in multiple problem behaviors, such as substance abuse, having unprotected sex, engaging in criminal activity and failing in school. These youth are more likely to have low expectations for their futures and low resistance to peer influences. They are also more likely to lack parental support and live in a deprived neighborhood (Dryfoos, 1990).

Programmatic interventions cannot substitute for effectiveness in the basic public institutions that serve youth, nor can they replace family and neighborhood strength. Nonetheless, there is consensus among youth-focused practitioners, policymakers and researchers that whether through families, basic institutions or special programs, youth will always need positive, caring relationships with adults to facilitate their transition to adulthood.

In 1989, Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) embarked on a multiyear, multistudy research initiative designed to address the question of whether social programs can provide supportive and effective adult relationships for at-risk youth. The research agenda includes studies of Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America; six Campus Partners in Learning programs; four Linking Lifetimes programs; and the focus of this report, P/PV's Adult/Youth Relationships Pilot Project--two pilot mentoring programs that matched volunteers with youth adjudicated to the juvenile justice system.

Having passed the midpoint of this research initiative on mentoring, we can conclude that given youth's need for caring and consistent relationships with adults, and the scarcity of and/or heightened need for such relationships in the lives of at-risk youth, program interventions like mentoring can meet this significant need, at least in part. While such interventions are unlikely to produce long-term effects in and of themselves, well-implemented programmatic relationships can play an important role in a broader strategy designed to serve the needs of at-risk youth (Furano, Roaf, Styles and Branch, 1993; Styles and Morrow, 1992; Freedman, 1992; Tierney and Branch, 1992).

P/PV's interest in mentoring programs was sparked by its 1988 study of five programs that matched older adult volunteers (aged 55 and older) with at-risk youth. This exploratory study found that strong relationships were formed by a significant number of pairs; that the elder who volunteered were highly receptive to undertaking stimulating and productive activity; and that the youth, often in crisis and without much adult support or involvement in their lives, welcomed the elders' interest (Freedman, 1988). These findings were corroborated by P/PV's 1992 study of four intergenerational programs developed by Temple University's Center for Intergenerational Learning (Styles and Morrow, 1992). In both studies, approximately two-thirds of the matches were classified as effective, meaning that the youth and adult met regularly and established reciprocal bonds.

The results of these research efforts provide sound backing for mentoring's hypothesized benefits: relationships between unrelated adults and youth can take hold, and appear to meet a need in the youth's life. Yet other, perhaps more critical, assertions about mentoring remain to be verified; most important, if mentoring is to be a viable policy option in youth-serving practice, it must demonstrate the ability to reach large numbers of youth in critical need. Thus, mentoring's potential growth probably depends on whether its practices can be integrated into the services of large-scale, public youth-serving institutions.

Unfortunately, little is known about mentoring's value to mainstream institutions. With the notable exception of school-based programs (e.g., Project RAISE of Baltimore; Mentors, Inc. of Washington, D.C.; and Career Beginnings), large institutions have not integrated mentoring activities into their essential services. Thus, mentoring has been without an institutional home in the world of social policy. Moreover, most mentoring programs have not targeted high-risk youth but have focused their energies on those youth predicted to be more receptive to mentoring. To persuade more public institutions to adopt mentoring, the parameters of the intervention must be specified.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

In 1990, P/PV designed a pilot project to answer questions about mentoring's usefulness. As a way of testing mentoring's ability to serve large numbers of at-risk youth, P/PV targeted large-scale, public youth-serving institutions, a strategy reflecting our belief that mentoring cannot be a stand-in for comprehensive services, but can serve as a vital component of an agency or program.

P/PV chose juvenile justice systems as the focus of this demonstration for four reasons. First, the system serves large numbers of youth: an estimated 1,264,800 youth were adjudicated in 1990.[1] Second, theory and program experience suggest that introducing a mentor during a time of transition, as when juvenile offenders in residential programming return to their communities, could ease youth's stress and promote prosocial behavior (Gottlieb, 1988). Third, juvenile justice systems nationally were looking for ways to improve their programming and were interested in community-based efforts. Thus, they were particularly receptive to the introduction of mentoring. Finally, youth involved in the juvenile justice system represent populations at heightened risk, not only of future incarceration, but of failing in school and experiencing difficulty gaining employment--events for which negative impacts are felt well into adulthood (National Research Council Panel on High-Risk Youth, 1993). There is little question that the needs of these youth are great and that implementing a program for this population presents a rigorous test of the viability of mentoring as a key component of youth policy.

---

[1] In the juvenile court system, youth are not judged innocent or guilty. They are either adjudicated or not adjudicated. To be adjudicated by the juvenile judge is to be judged in need of some sort of official intervention: probation, referral for service, or commitment to the care of a public juvenile corrections agency. Normally, youth are charged with a crime and brought before a juvenile court judge several times before they are adjudicated and placed in the care of the corrections agency.

Like most youth-serving institutions, juvenile justice systems face many problems. Agencies are charged with simultaneously holding costs down, controlling burgeoning caseloads and providing rehabilitative services to youth. Given these constraints, P/PV realized that it was unlikely that mentoring could be integrated into juvenile justice agencies unless it could be done at little additional cost, with few additional resources, and with little additional burden on agency staff already overtaxed by the sheer number of youth in need.

TWO PARTICIPATING SITES

The two participating sites, located in Atlanta and St. Louis, were selected through a Request for Proposal process conducted during the spring and summer of 1991. (For more information on this process, see Greim [1992]). Both sites serve adjudicated youth in the care of the state's juvenile justice agencies. The St. Louis program is operated by the Missouri Division of Children and Youth Services (MDCYS); the Atlanta program is run jointly by the Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services (GDCYS) and the Southeast Regional Office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), with GDCYS responsible for the operation of the program and the NAACP responsible for recruiting adult volunteers. To help defray the cost of implementing the model, each site received a $65,000 grant from P/PV. This money was used primarily to hire a project director at each site--the only new staff members hired to implement the program. The project was conducted from October 1991 through June 1993. Participating facilities and personnel in the juvenile justice agencies are briefly described in the following sections.

St. Louis

The following MDCYS facilities in the St. Louis region participated in the mentoring program:

- Hogan Street Regional Youth Center. A 30-bed facility, Hogan Street is located in an inner-city neighborhood and houses juvenile males from the region who have been charged with the most serious offenses.

- Missouri Hills. The Missouri Hills campus is 30 minutes from downtown St. Louis. Three facilities housed on this campus participated in the program: 1) Fort Bellfountaine, a two-building facility serving 48 boys; 2) Twin Rivers, an all-female facility housed in a single building with 24 beds; and 3) Spanish Lakes, a

24-bed, all-male facility housed in a single building. Each building contains two large dormitory-style bedrooms, a kitchen, living room areas and staff offices.

- Babler Lodge. This facility is located approximately 30 miles from St. Louis, and has capacity to house 24 boys.

Each of these facilities is organized around "group" units. Each group consists of 10 to 12 youth supervised by one group leader with assistance from six youth specialists. An Individual Treatment Program (ITP) is prepared for each youth after he or she has been in the institution 30 days. The ITP specifies the youth's strengths and weaknesses, as well as goals, objectives and strategies for addressing the youth's problems. In most facilities, the youth as an individual and the group as a whole are classified according to their maturity and level of responsibility. These ratings help define treatment goals and objectives, and the levels of privilege youth can have, especially for off-site visits. While in the facility, youth attend school and treatment activities. Each youth's progress is evaluated on a monthly basis until facility staff recommend that he or she is ready for release. On the average, youth spend six months in the facility.

Following release, youth are placed under the supervision of an aftercare worker for approximately six months. If youth are 17, aftercare may be limited to three months. The amount of contact between the aftercare worker and the youth varies, depending on the youth and his or her need for supervision. Aftercare workers are required to have a face-to-face meeting with a youth once a month and generally have some other contact with the youth once every week or two. Some youth are also assigned "trackers"--college students who work with the aftercare worker and provide more intensive supervision. Youth on aftercare status must meet certain requirements (such as to attend school), but are provided with few services.

Atlanta

The Atlanta mentoring program included youth served by two different types of rehabilitative programming. First, the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Center (YDC) serves 106 male youth as the only residential institution in Atlanta and one of four residential facilities in the state. The least secure of the four Georgia YDCs, the Lorenzo Benn facility receives youth from around the state, with approximately 30 to 35 percent coming from the metropolitan Atlanta area. These Atlanta residents were included in the program.

The Lorenzo Benn campus consists of three residential cottages that house 20 youth each, and one large dormitory that houses the remaining youth. Each cottage has a cottage life supervisor who serves as the youth's caseworker and counselor, and five youth development workers who directly supervise the youth. A proportionate number of supervisors and development workers serve youth in the dormitory. A court service worker is assigned to visit the youth at least quarterly in the institution and prepare options for the youth's return to the community.

As in St. Louis, youth at the Lorenzo Benn YDC attend a facility-based school year round, and have both group counseling and individual counseling sessions with their cottage life supervisor several times weekly. Based on their behavior, youth receive a security classification rating that determines their level of privileges, including off-campus trips. Many youth's privilege levels rise and fall erratically. Youth also receive a written treatment plan that specifies their needs and objectives for treatment.

Youth are sentenced to the Lorenzo Benn YDC for a minimum of three months; some stay longer than 18 months. The average sentence is six months. Once released, youth are supervised by a court service worker. Although youth are formally placed in state custody for two years, they are frequently released from aftercare before that period is over. Youth in aftercare typically see the court service worker (or aftercare worker) every two to three weeks, with weekly telephone contact. As in St. Louis, aftercare is generally limited to periodic contact between the youth and aftercare worker.[2]

Due to the limited number of Atlanta youth housed at the Lorenzo Benn campus, youth who had been adjudicated to nonresidential community-based programs were also included in the pilot. The majority of Atlanta youth in state custody are in nonresidential programs. Once juvenile court adjudicates a youth to state custody through the GDCYS, a screening committee determines the treatment plan and placement for the youth.[3] If the committee determines that there is some stability and support in the home environment, youth are generally directed to community-based treatments. (Extremely serious crimes generally warrant commitment to the YDC regardless of home environment, though some youth who commit serious offenses, including violent crimes, do receive a nonresidential placement.) Youth receiving a community placement may be sent to a community school or community treatment center (CTC), or may simply be required to maintain weekly or monthly contact with a court service worker.

Youth placed in CTCs generally report three afternoons a week following school. Some CTCs are open all day, allowing out-of-school youth to attend according to their own schedules. The CTCs offer such services as group, individual and family counseling; vocational and employability skills training; job search; and alcohol and drug education.

---

[2] The two systems use different names for staff who perform similar duties; in the interest of simplicity, however, "caseworker" is used in this report for staff who supervise youth inside facilities, at community treatment centers and out of district offices. "Aftercare worker" is used to describe staff whose primary responsibility is the provision of supervision after youth are released from residential facilities.

[3] Youth who are classified by the court as "designated felons" or who are Superior Court commitments are always sent to YDCs.

Youth who are functioning two to three grade levels below average may be placed in a community school operated by GDCYS rather than in a CTC. These youth receive greater supervision and more individualized instruction than they could in regular city schools.

The caseload of court service workers in Atlanta varies tremendously by location. Court service workers operating out of CTCs generally have smaller caseloads--often fewer than 20 cases. In contrast, court service workers operating out of the District offices can have caseloads numbering close to 90.

THE PROGRAM MODEL

The mentoring program used in this pilot project incorporated the following goals and features:

1. Scale. The program was intended to create 100 matches between adult volunteers and at-risk youth within the first six months of the 20-month pilot. The matches were to last one year, with pairs of adults and youth meeting for a minimum of one to two hours each week.

2. Elders as mentors. Half the adult volunteers at each site were to be 55 years of age or older, testing whether this growing segment of the population constitutes an untapped, willing resource for serving at-risk youth. P/PV also wanted to investigate the so-called "double social utility" of intergenerational mentoring programs--the possible benefits of participation for older mentors as well as for youth (Freedman, Harvey and Ventura-Merkle, 1992; Styles and Morrow, 1992; Freedman, 1988).

3. Decentralized supervision. It was determined that a key program function, supervision of the adult/youth matches, needed to be decentralized--i.e., added to the existing duties of staff. In the smaller programs P/PV has examined, a mentor coordinator typically supported a caseload of 20 matches; unfortunately, the possibility of achieving such a ratio in agencies serving large numbers of youth seemed remote. Therefore, caseworkers were assigned the responsibility of monitoring and supporting the mentoring relationships involving youth on their caseloads, to test whether this function could be subsumed into their current duties without great burden.

4. One-on-one meetings. The program model called for mentors to meet with youth one-on-one. Meetings were to be held initially in the facility and continue once youth were released, with the goal of facilitating the youth's successful transition to community life. Activities and topics of discussion were not prescribed by the program but were left to the mentor's discretion.

RESEARCH

The demonstration's research was designed to address the following questions:

1. Can mentoring "work" in juvenile justice agencies?

2. Will adults--and especially elders--come forward to take on the demands of mentoring youth in a juvenile justice institution?

3. Is there a set of practices or features that characterize the adult role in an effective mentoring relationship with adjudicated youth?

4. What levels of recruitment, training, screening, matching, supervision and costs are required to administer such a program effectively, given the unique needs of this population of youth?

5. Does participating in the mentoring program make observable changes in youth's attitudes, perceptions and behaviors?

The two pilot programs were also intended to test whether match supervision could be handled by the youth's caseworkers, and whether the adult/youth relationship could be sustained as youth transitioned back into the community.

Finally, the study was designed to investigate whether the agencies were better able to serve their target populations as a result of the mentoring program, both within the institutional setting and after youth's release. The study addresses whether agency staff perceived that the mentoring component improved service delivery, such as enhancing current treatment within the institution, improving capabilities postrelease, and facilitating the agencies' general functioning.

To determine whether the mentoring component was successfully integrated into the agencies, we examined the number of matches created; how often matches met; participants' satisfaction with the match; the amount and quality of recruitment, training, supervision and screening provided; and participants' and staff members' satisfaction with the program.

METHODOLOGY[4]

Three research site visits took place to document early program start-up, recruitment efforts and ongoing program operations. The first visit, conducted in January 1992, focused on depicting the institutions, the youth's progression through the system, and staff responsibilities both prior to and subsequent to program initiation. Spring and winter site visits focused on determining the institution's ability to incorporate mentors and whether the mentoring program helped the institution meet its goals, and on documenting the program's transition as youth left the facility and reentered the community.

---

[4] See the Appendix for a more complete description of data collection methods.

Two P/PV staff members visited each site to interview mentors, youth and agency personnel (those responsible for operating the system and line staff who interacted with youth on a daily basis). P/PV staff also observed training sessions, and collected information from the youth's case files and program records.

DATA SOURCES

Table 1 outlines the data sources used in the research, and the rates of completion for each; uneven response rates prohibited collection of complete data from all sources. The range and types of data collected and analyzed for the study are described in the following sections.

Mentor logs. Mentors were asked to complete weekly contact logs, organized to allow documentation of not only whether the pair met during the week, but the nature of the contact or lack thereof. If the match did not meet, the mentor noted the reason. If the match did meet, the mentor noted where the meeting occurred, the activities that took place, and the duration of the meeting. Mentors completed logs for 73 percent of the weeks in which they were matched.[5]

Program records. The program sites supplied information about when matches were made and terminated, and when youth were discharged from the facilities. In addition, the sites provided information from computerized case files on the youth's criminal history. These data included age at first adjudication, type of offenses committed and chronicity of offenses. Data from this source were available for 96 percent of the youth. Program records data collected also included initial mentor applications in St. Louis and screening interviews with Atlanta mentors--both of which presented demographic information on the mentors and their reasons for wanting to participate in the program. Applications/interviews were available for 115 mentors (77%).

Questionnaires. Mentors and youth completed questionnaires when they entered the program, before being matched, and following their participation in the program. Mentors were sent the follow-up questionnaire when their match terminated. Youth received the follow-up approximately one year after they were first matched.

---

[5] Mentors varied in the regularity with which they completed the mentor logs. Nine of the 150 mentors completed no logs. When these nine cases are excluded, log data are available for 75 percent of the weeks in which mentors and youth were matched.

TABLE 1

DATA SOURCES

DATA SOURCE	DATA COLLECTED	COMPLETION RATES
Mentor logs	Frequency of meeting, length of match, reasons for not meeting	154 matches (94%), 75% of weeks matched
Program records	Length of match, reasons for termination, how heard about the program, demographic characteristics of mentors and youth	Varied from 55% to 100% of matches
Agency records on youth	Youth's offense history, family composition	154 youth (96%)
Mentor application/ interview	Demographic characteristics of mentors, reasons for joining program, past mentoring experience	115 mentors (77%)
Mentor baseline survey	Demographic characteristics of mentors	138 mentors (92%)
Youth baseline survey	Demographic characteristics of youth, pretest attitudinal and behavioral measures	158 youth (98%)
Mentor follow-up survey	Implementation issues, interactions with youth, how heard about program, reasons for termination, frequency of meeting, length of match	103 mentors (69%)
Youth follow-up survey	Post-test attitudinal and behavioral measures, interactions with mentor, implementation issues, reasons for termination, frequency of meeting, length of match	72 youth (45%)
In-depth interviews with matches	Pair members' interactions, implementation issues, frequency of meeting, length of match, reasons for termination, background on youth's lives	25 youth and 36 mentors representing 42 pairs
Staff interviews	Implementation issues	130 interviews with 76 staff members
Focus groups with mentors, youth and representatives of elder-serving organizations	Implementation issues	Thirteen focus groups

The baseline questionnaires collected demographic information on both the mentors and youth. The youth questionnaire assessed youth's feelings about themselves on a variety of social psychological and behavioral measures.[6] Baseline data were collected for 98 percent of the 161 youth who participated in the project and for 138 mentors (92%).

The follow-up questionnaire repeated items from the baseline questionnaire to detect any changes, and included additional questions about both the youth's and mentor's satisfaction with the relationship and the mentoring program. Follow-up questionnaires were completed by 69 percent of the mentors and 45 percent of the youth.[7] Due to the low response rate, the representativeness of data from the youth survey is suspect. Hence, data from this survey is used sparingly--primarily to verify findings from other data sources.

In-depth interviews. Semistructured face-to-face interviews were conducted separately with mentors and youth representing 42 pairs. These pairs were selected to represent a cross-section of matches that originated in community and facility settings, and matches that were either ongoing or had terminated. Both pair members in 19 matches were interviewed. For the other 23 pairs, one pair member was either unavailable to be interviewed or failed to show up for a scheduled interview. Thus, in 17 matches, only the mentor was interviewed; in six others, only the youth. The interview transcripts were content-analyzed to examine differences in interactional styles, and matches exhibiting each pattern were counted.

Use of data. Data from the various sources were merged to inform analyses involving issues of program implementation, relationship formation and outcomes. By using a multimethod data collection strategy, we hoped to compensate for the limitations of any one method by deploying another. For example, while the mentor logs tell us which matches met frequently and which did not, in-depth interviews provide us an understanding of why some matches lasted while others did not. Moreover, confidence in the findings is enhanced by analyses of multiple data sources that point to the same conclusions. Throughout the text, the 25 youth and 36 mentors who participated in the in-depth interviews are quoted to illustrate and support findings from other data sources.

This report documents the data that were collected, as well as our analyses of those data. Chapter II describes the youth who participated in the demonstration and their particular needs. Chapter III examines the recruitment process, describes the adults who came forward to volunteer, and discusses the matching process. Chapter IV describes frequency of meeting and match longevity, obstacles to implementation, participant and staff perceptions of the program, and the program's effect on the institution. Chapter V discusses patterns of interaction characteristic of lasting matches. Finally, Chapter VI summarizes the findings and discusses whether--and how--mentoring can be integrated into juvenile justice systems.

---

[6] The mentor baseline questionnaire included some social psychological measures designed to examine the benefits of mentoring to elders. However, as detailed in Chapter III, too few elders were recruited to use these measures.

[7] For a full discussion of attrition and related problems, see the Appendix.

II. PARTICIPATING YOUTH

The youth in this mentoring project are more profoundly at risk than those served by most mentoring programs. Their delinquent status is but one of the obstacles that threaten to impede their successful transition to adulthood. Endemic to the lives of these youth are the harsh and pervasive realities of poverty, violence and family instability--factors that both increase the need for supportive adult contact and substantially elevate the challenge of mentoring this population.

This chapter describes how youth were selected to participate, profiles the youth who came forward, and explores the circumstances in their lives that call for intervention by supportive adults.

PROFILES OF PARTICIPATING YOUTH

A total of 161 youth volunteered for the mentoring project and were matched with mentors. Caseworkers issued the initial invitation to youth on their caseload, describing the mentoring program and gauging youth's interest in participating. Caseworkers generally used their discretion in determining which youth would be invited to participate. Most caseworkers generally said they looked for youth who would "benefit" from the relationship--youth who lacked a strong parent in the home or positive male role model, and who made poor use of their leisure time. However, some staff said they selected youth who either had parents who were receptive to the program or who, in their assessment, would be able to establish a relationship easily. So that relationships could continue after the youth were released, only youth who lived in the Atlanta or St. Louis metropolitan areas were invited to participate.

Caseworkers reported that most youth they initially approached indicated interest in having a mentor. As the program became more established, other youth approached caseworkers and asked to participate. The caseworkers reported that more youth wanted mentors than could be accommodated.

The youth's basic demographic characteristics are presented in Table 2. They ranged in age from 11 to 18; their average age was 15 years. The majority in both sites were aged 15 and 16, male and black.

For these youth, juvenile delinquency clearly began in the pre- or early-teen years. Indeed, 59 percent of the youth in our study had been adjudicated or referred to the courts before they reached age 14; 14- and 15-year-olds accounted for an additional 37 percent of first offenders.[8]

---

[8] St. Louis provided us with data on the age at which youth were first referred to the court. The average age at first court referral was 13.4 years. In Atlanta, information on first court referral was not available, but the average age of first adjudication (where the youth is brought before the court on a specific charge and committed to the state) was 12.7 years.

TABLE 2

YOUTH CHARACTERISTICS

	ATLANTA	ST. LOUIS
Match Origin		
Facility	36%	100%
Community	64	—
Gender		
Male	80%	83%
Female	20	17
Race		
Black	79%	66%
White	11	30
Hispanic	5	3
Native American	5	1
Multi-ethnic	1	—
Average Age at Match	15.0	15.7
Offense History[a]		
Property crimes	70%	68%
Crimes against persons	42	34
Drug offenses	27	18
Weapons offenses	17	18
Status offenses	24	35
Family Household Composition		
Single parent	64%	63%
Two parents	19	29
Other relative	12	8
Foster parent	5	—
Youth Who Are Teen Parents[b]	16%	17%
Evidence of Health Problems		
Mental health problem	25%	18%
Drug/alcohol problem	35	34
School Disaffection		
Dropped out	16%	21%
Skipped school sometimes or often	67	75
Suspended sometimes or often	81	79
Repeated a grade	83	64
NUMBER MATCHED	84	77

NOTE: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding, or because youth may fit multiple categories.

[a] Percentage who had ever committed an offense in these categories. Youth may fit multiple categories.

[b] Four girls in Atlanta and one girl in St. Louis are mothers, the remaining teen parents are fathers.

Youth involved in this study reflect the preponderance of minority youth among those adjudicated and incarcerated across the nation, particularly in the state systems. Of those youth who volunteered to be matched with a mentor, 73 percent were African-American, 20 percent were white, 4 percent were Hispanic, 3 percent were Native-American and 1 percent were of mixed ethnicity.

The crimes for which youth in this study were adjudicated are typical of delinquent crime in general: they range widely--from sexual assault and voluntary manslaughter to "status" offenses.[9] As is the case with adjudicated youth nationwide (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1992), offenses against property constituted the bulk of their criminal activity. The Georgia and Missouri agencies reported that 69 percent of the youth were adjudicated for--or had a history of committing--crimes against property, (e.g., burglary, theft, property damage); 38 percent were found to have committed crimes against persons (e.g., manslaughter, rape, aggravated and simple assault, armed robbery); 23 percent had committed drug offenses; and 18 percent had been adjudicated on a weapon charge. The average youth had committed 3.5 offenses that resulted in adjudication during his or her young life.

In addition, the juvenile justice agencies reported that 35 percent of the youth had a previous or existing drug or alcohol problem. Fifty percent of the youth themselves reported on the baseline survey that they drank alcohol at least twice a week; 32 percent said they smoked marijuana at least twice weekly; and 32 percent said they "sometimes" or "pretty often" brought drugs or alcohol to school.

THE CORRELATES OF DELINQUENCY

Research informs us that an identifiable set of social-psychological and socioeconomic factors are highly correlated with delinquency. These factors include poverty, neglect, disaffection with school, chaotic family structure and family violence (National Research Council Panel on High-Risk Youth, 1993; Resnick, Burt, Newmark and Reilly, 1992; Land, McCall and Cohen, 1990; Snyder and Patterson, 1987).

The factor that appears to be associated with delinquency most frequently is poverty. Some researchers estimate the poverty rate among incarcerated youth to be as high as 72 percent (Simonsen, 1991). While clearly not all youth who grow up in poverty are delinquents, young offenders are more likely to be poor. There is evidence that youth who grow up in poverty experience a wider and more serious range of stressful life events than those with higher family incomes, and appear to do so more frequently during their youth (McLoyd, 1990). These poverty-linked stressors--each of which is also frequently associated with delinquency--include unemployment, violent victimization of the child or a family member, and drug or alcohol addiction.

---

[9] Status offenses are acts committed by juveniles that bring them to the attention of juvenile courts, but would not be crimes if committed by adults. Typical status offenses are truancy, running away from home and curfew violations (Champion, 1992).

Minority status is also correlated with delinquency; when youth are poor and minority, this association is amplified (National Research Council Panel on High-Risk Youth, 1993). Scholars have identified a number of factors that help explain this correlation. First, what distinguishes minority youth in poverty from other poor children is the extent to which their adversities are chronic. Minority youth are more likely than poor white youth to spend not just part, but their whole lives in uninterrupted poverty. Indeed, black children and teens represent a full 90 percent of children who live in poverty for at least 10 of their first 15 years of life (Duncan and Rodgers, 1988).

Frequently segregated in urban areas of concentrated poverty, poor minority youth appear particularly imperiled. First, they experience increased exposure to concrete dangers, such as the presence of gunfire or the lure of lucrative, quick-selling drugs. Second, they are endangered by the absence of critical safeguards, such as strong community institutions that could shield them from harm. Further, while some positive supports do exist in their communities, such youth are disproportionately less likely to have access to stress-mediating resources frequently associated with resilience in the face of this type of adversity--such as the consistent, positive attention of adults (Jenks and Mayer, 1990; Wilson, 1987).

Family and community strains, particularly when they coincide, enhance poor and minority youth's susceptibility to delinquent behavior, arrest, adjudication and incarceration. The following section describes serious life stressors faced by the youth who participated in this project. These descriptions paint a disturbing portrait of these youth's lives.

High-Risk Environments

Youth's own reports on the availability of weapons and the proliferation of gangs, drugs and violence depict communities in severe distress. Of the 25 youth we interviewed in depth, almost all reported drugs and violence as routine in their neighborhoods. Violence appears to surround the young people's homes, becoming for many a commonplace neighborhood feature:

> Like it's my street and my house is in the middle . . . [where there] used to be a store they tore down, they found a lady body up in there. And around the corner from my house, two people had got shot. And down the street from my house, they found a lady body with her arms and stuff unattached (match 3, youth).

Further, 66 percent of the youth responding to the baseline survey indicated that they had participated in a gang fight, and 29 percent reported that they fight "pretty often."

Particularly striking was the prevalence of weapons and the wide variety that youth found readily available. One youth described gaining possession of three different types of weapons within a relatively short time and with very little effort:

> Youth: I got some friends and they go . . . [to] a skating rink . . . every Saturday . . . every time we go we get into a fight with some boy or sometime we jump somebody. Then we end up getting guns put on, or sometimes we have a gun. But most of the guns I had, I lost them or I gave them to my friend and he lost them . . . then a couple of days later, I'll pop up on a gun and I take it: "Look, I found one."
>
> Interviewer: Where do you find them?
>
> Youth: Like one time in the room next to the boys' bathroom . . . I laid my jacket in there, and I opened up this box, and in this box was a bag, and I opened up the bag, there was a 25 automatic with the clip on the side. So I put the clip in and I put it in my pocket and walked out the door. Then the other day I found a sawed off shotgun . . . in the back of my yard. So I came in the house, [and] I still had the 25. So then that Saturday came, I went to the skating rink and I looked over some bushes 'cause I had stepped on something, right, it was some boys was chasing my friend, you know, how we play around or something like that. And they were chasing him. So I tripped over something and I went back to see what I tripped over, it was a 357 magnum. So I got that one and I kept it.
>
> Interviewer: It was just lying there?
>
> Youth: Boys will hide their guns in certain spots . . . so I tripped over it and I picked it up . . . I put it in my pants and walked around (match 20, youth).

This youth was not an isolated case. Fifty-four percent of the youth in our baseline survey said they carried weapons at least "sometimes"--a practice that seems firmly interwoven in the pattern of many youth's social lives.

The interviews clearly indicate that many youth return to environments characterized by drugs, violence and gangs following their release from the juvenile justice facilities. While the program model stipulated that mentors assist the youth in making this transition, such environments present a powerful obstacle to successful passage into lawful and responsible behavior--and thus represent a considerable challenge for a mentoring relationship.

Family Strain

The adversity facing youth is not limited to their neighborhoods. Many must contend with equally difficult home lives and family relationships. While our baseline survey did not pursue the character of parent/child or family interactions systematically, in-depth interviews were replete with evidence of family disruption, strain and disintegration. Twenty-two of the 29 youth for whom we have detailed home-life data reside in situations we would characterize as "chaotic": their homes demonstrated significant patterns of severe stress, such as violence within the home, family members who are in gangs or incarcerated, and the protracted absence of a primary parent or guardian.[10]

As one mentor described her youth's home life:

> Her mother's fairly young, in her mid-30s. And when you have five brothers and sisters . . . [my youth is] more like the mother. And they have a live-in boyfriend there [and] she really don't like this live-in boyfriend. And at the first of the month, when her mom get her check, she gets her drink and the boyfriend gets a drink, then there's a fight, then there's the police . . . sometimes kids can almost be embarrassed of things their mother does. And [my youth] would revenge by fighting with her and calling the police on each other. And I say at least for four months I could guarantee you the police was there every day (match 32, mentor).

Violence in resolving family disputes was mentioned frequently in youth's descriptions of routine home life. As this mentor continued:

> I said, now we really need to talk, this is getting out of hand when your mother wants to get at you with a knife. Then she said well she really didn't mean to do it, she was just mad and she was drinking (match 32, mentor).

For many youth, a stable home proved elusive. According to one mentor:

> He didn't have a mother and he didn't know where his father was and he had a grandmother but she was incapacitated. He had one aunt and an uncle and the uncle was supposed to take him in. Well the uncle decides, on the day he's supposed to come and get [my youth] . . . that he's not taking [him] unless the state gives him money. And . . . he left [my youth] there. He left [him] at the facility that day (match 21, mentor).

---

[10] Twenty-five youth were interviewed, and in-depth interviews with mentors provided home-life information for an additional four youth.

Further, 10 of the 25 youth interviewed described long periods in their pre-adjudicated lives when they, their parents or siblings simply "disappeared" from home. Some youth appear to initiate such separations:

> Now, I can't say I lived with [my mother], 'cause I was never there, but that's where I would have lived if I had gone home. [I was just] living anywhere, with friends and stuff (match 18, youth).

However, this youth also suffered periodic abandonment, as his mentor describes:

> A lot of times . . . he'll seem like he has a lot on his mind and it may be his mother. Like she'll say she's gonna come by, she doesn't come by, she doesn't call. And there was a time where she actually left the state and he didn't know where she was. And she left two of the kids with somebody and they didn't know where she was. And I think he's also going through an identity crisis because he doesn't know who his dad is (match 18, mentor).

Not surprisingly, then, most of the youth interviewed (19 of 25) spoke of a lack of supportive adults in their home lives.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

Social-ecological contexts like those described in the preceding section are indeed grim. For youth attempting the task of maturing, such contexts can present not just risk, but real harm. Recently, scholars have devoted considerable attention to unearthing the strategies that families and young people can use to promote healthy development, despite the multiple risks and hazards that lace impoverished communities. One frequently cited variable marking successful youth from such backgrounds is the presence of some form of social support.

Research indicates that the support rendered by a reliable and involved adult can strengthen both families' and individual youth's resilience to the stresses of poverty and high-risk environments (Furstenberg, 1993; Rutter, 1987; Werner and Smith, 1982; Garbarino and Sherman, 1980). The studies that focus exclusively on young people who successfully navigate risk note that the presence of a consistently interested and involved adult can mitigate adversity's effects on youth's behavior and outlook (Cowen and Work, 1988; Werner and Smith, 1982). The precise mechanisms through which such support is transacted remain unclear, but research proposes the following as the two most protective aspects of support for youth under stress: (1) youth receive advice or emotional support that enhances their ability to cope, and (2) reliable adults provide a stress-reducing sense of "felt security," despite the presence of perceived threats (Sandler, Miller, Short and Wolchik, 1989; Bretherton, 1985).

It is clear that the youth participating in this project face considerable adversity in their home environments and communities, and that their problem behaviors--including delinquent acts, violent behavior, school disaffection and substance use--stand in the way of a successful transition to adulthood. The need of this population for supportive adult contact was one reason P/PV decided to undertake institutionalized mentoring in juvenile justice institutions. Given the adversity in these youth's lives, however, the difficulty of implementing a mentoring program is heightened and the impact on youth's lives is likely to be modest at best.

Whether these mentoring programs could attract volunteers willing to mentor this highly challenged and greatly-in-need population was another key question for this project. It is to this issue that we turn in Chapter III.

III. RECRUITMENT AND MATCHING

A key issue addressed in this project was scale. Most mentoring programs are modest in scope, and capable of serving only small numbers of youth. P/PV felt that to have significant implications for social policy, mentoring programs needed to demonstrate an ability to serve substantial numbers of at-risk youth. Thus, the two sites were each asked to recruit and match 100 mentors and youth in the six-month period between October 1, 1991 and April 1, 1992.

RECRUITMENT

In St. Louis, the project director, an employee of the MDCYS, was largely responsible for recruitment. In Atlanta, recruitment fell under the jurisdiction of the NAACP.

Recruitment of volunteers to work with youth--particularly adjudicated youth--proved an arduous task. By April 1, neither site had met the targeted number of 100 matches--St. Louis had made 40 and Atlanta 44. Recruitment and matching was extended through September 1992, resulting in a total of 78 matches in St. Louis and 85 in Atlanta.[11] At both sites, some mentors whose match terminated prematurely were rematched. (In St. Louis eight mentors were rematched once and another was rematched twice; in Atlanta, four mentors were rematched.) In two cases, youth were rematched. A total of 150 mentors were recruited and matched--69 in St. Louis and 81 in Atlanta.

A second central objective of the demonstration was to examine critical differences between elders and non-elders in their availability for recruitment and their ability to form relationships. P/PV's investigations of other intergenerational mentoring programs had found elders to be exemplary mentors to young people (Styles and Morrow, 1992; Freedman, 1988); however, no studies had been conducted that compare the relative effectiveness of elder and non-elder mentors. To address this objective, we asked sites to try to recruit equal numbers of elders and non-elders. However, recruitment of elders proved difficult: Atlanta recruited only eight elders, and St. Louis only three. Thus while we learned much about the first issue--recruitment of elders; the small number of elder mentors actually recruited and matched precluded an examination of elder mentors' relative effectiveness.

---

[11] For matches to be included in the demonstration, both the mentor and youth were required to sign a consent form. Four matches in Atlanta and two in St. Louis were excluded because either the mentor or youth did not consent to participate in the research.

General Recruitment Efforts

The sites concentrated their initial efforts on recruiting volunteers from the general population. Recruitment strategies at both sites centered on the use of media and on presentations to community groups. Each site drew substantial interest when a feature story on the program first appeared in their city's major newspaper. At each site, the initial story resulted in over 100 inquiries about the program.

Although the newspaper remained a recruiting tool, subsequent stories on the program spawned far less response. (A story in January 1993 generated only 10 to 15 calls in St. Louis.) In fact, over the first six months of the project, 47 percent of mentors recruited first heard about the program through the newspaper. In the second half, mentors recruited through the newspaper dropped to 17 percent, with mentors more likely to be recruited by friends or family members.

Across the life of the project, nearly half the mentors (44%) first heard about the program through a media presentation: 33 percent from the newspaper, 10 percent from the radio and 1 percent from television. The second most common source was word of mouth--generally a friend or family member (22%), followed by a presentation by staff (12%) and church (7%). In St. Louis, a number of mentors were recruited from among agency staff.

Both sites made presentations to various community groups, including black fraternities and sororities, corporate retiree organizations, churches, local colleges and civic organizations. Efforts to enlist the support of local community groups to endorse the effort and assist in recruitment were less successful in St. Louis, where the MDCYS was largely unknown to community groups. In Atlanta, the name recognition engendered by the NAACP appeared to boost efforts to enlist the help of other community groups and, indeed, resulted in the recruitment of a substantial number of black mentors, many of them male. For a more detailed discussion of efforts to recruit non-elders, see the *Initial Implementation Report* (Greim, 1992).

The Recruitment of Elders

The low number of elders recruited at both sites was disappointing. Part of the problem may be attributable to sites' initial focus on recruiting from the general population. Understandably, sites were concerned with how successful they would be at recruiting volunteers of any age to work with adjudicated youth, but the strategies they used to interest the general public proved unsuccessful in attracting elders. Moreover, the initial newspaper story, while generating substantial interest in the program, created a backlog of mentor applications waiting for processing. Staff attention was thus diverted from the issue of recruiting elders as they worked to process applications from the non-elder population.

We believe sites failed to recruit significant numbers of elder mentors for four main reasons: (1) stereotypes of adjudicated youth among elders and stereotypes of elders among agency staff; (2) lack of time and resources necessary to recruit elders; (3) transportation problems; and (4) lack of stipends.

The Barrier of Stereotypes

At both sites, local retirement agencies, such as the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), were approached to assist in the recruitment of elders for the program. Although representatives from elder organizations at both sites were willing to refer interested elder volunteers, they were pessimistic that many elder volunteers would come forward due to a fear of youth involved in the juvenile justice system. In both Atlanta and St. Louis, incidents involving violent crime had been well publicized in the media, heightening citizens' concerns about personal safety.

In addition, sites found themselves competing for elders' time with other volunteer organizations whose activities did not put them at risk. Some caseworkers found that elders stated a preference for working with younger youth who had committed less serious crimes than is typically the case among the ranks of adjudicated juvenile offenders.

Negative perceptions of adjudicated youth were not the only barrier to elder recruitment. Although P/PV has found that elders can be exemplary mentors to youth, evidence from interviews and observations of initial recruitment strategies indicates that most site staff did not "buy in" to the concept that elders might be better mentors than non-elders, thus justifying the additional time and energy necessary to recruit them. The use of elder mentors was perceived as an issue of great interest to basic research, but not as one with particular implications for program success. Resistance to elder mentors was also observed among caseworkers, who were reluctant to match youth on their caseloads with elder mentors. Some staff expressed concerns that elderly mentors were more gullible and more easily manipulated by the youth. One caseworker, who felt an elder mentor was being manipulated by a youth on his caseload, said "This old lady has no business with this kid."

Other intergenerational mentoring programs have also found that negative attitudes toward elder and youth populations by professionals in youth-serving and elder-serving agencies present obstacles to intergenerational collaboration that are difficult to overcome (Center for Intergenerational Learning, 1991). Although a presentation by an elder mentor from another program laid to rest some caseworkers' concerns about elder mentors, others maintained reservations and continued to be reluctant to match elders coming their way.

Time and Resources

Ultimately, P/PV's requirement that the project go to scale in a six-month period proved in direct conflict with the specification that half the mentors recruited be elders. Both programs found that the short period of time allotted for recruitment was insufficient to develop and foster relationships with elder-serving organizations and work on individualized recruitment plans. This view is further supported by the experience of Temple University's Center for Intergenerational Learning, which found that the programs in their Linking Lifetimes initiative took up to a year to recruit 15 to 20 elder volunteers at each site.

The experiences of the Atlanta site are illustrative of the time- and resource-intensive nature of elder recruitment. When elders failed to respond to media coverage and group presentations, Atlanta formed an elder recruitment subcommittee to develop specific strategies for elders. This subcommittee targeted black churches (which had a large constituency of elder members), sending a member to the church to develop a relationship with church leaders, thereby gaining their trust and support in making presentations to elder church members. This time-intensive approach resulted in six additional elder matches between May and September of 1992. Seven additional elders completed training during this time but had not been matched by the end of September. As late as December 1992, some elders were still waiting to be matched, despite a waiting list of youth wanting mentors. This likely reflects both continued staff resistance to matching elders and the general inefficiency of the matching process.

Lack of Transportation

Transportation was also cited by project staff and elder-serving organizations as a barrier to elder recruitment. Some elders recruited did not have cars, and the facilities were not easily accessible by public transportation--two St. Louis campuses were 15 and 30 miles from the city and totally inaccessible. Other intergenerational programs solve the transportation problem either by recruiting mentors who live in the same neighborhood as youth or by providing a van to take mentors from a central location to the program site. However, because the elders were recruited from different organizations and churches, no form of group transportation could be arranged.

Lack of Stipends

In our interviews, both elder mentors and representatives of elder-serving organizations emphasized the importance of stipends in attracting elder volunteers. Both Atlanta and St. Louis were in competition with other organizations that offered the elders stipends. Although elder volunteers stressed that money alone would not motivate elder involvement, they felt cash assistance could take some of the burden off the volunteer by providing money for transportation and spending money to use when going places with the youth.

Concerned about how few elders had been recruited, P/PV authorized payment of $50/month stipends for elders in April 1992. The sites, however, resisted offering these stipends. They were concerned with two issues: (1) that the agency would not be able to offer stipends once the project was over and P/PV was no longer providing funds; and (2) that offering stipends to elders was unfair to non-elder volunteers and might cause dissension. While stipends were mentioned on brochures produced specifically for elder recruitment, which were distributed during presentations to elder-serving organizations, they were never advertised in print, or mentioned in newspaper articles or Public Service Announcements.

Staff resistance to matching elders, elders' concerns about juvenile offenders, transportation problems, lack of stipends, and the lack of resources (both time and money) to intensively pursue elders all contributed to the sites' failure to tap the elder population as mentors for this project. Thus, we cannot determine whether elders are more effective mentors to adjudicated youth than are non-elders. Our experience makes clear, however, that elder recruitment requires greater resources and more time than is necessary for recruitment in the general population.

MENTOR CHARACTERISTICS

While the elder population proved the most difficult, recruiting volunteers of any age to work with seriously troubled youth was a major challenge. Stereotypes and fears of adjudicated youth are not unique to elders (though elders may feel a particular vulnerability), and programs serving less troubled youth were simultaneously seeking volunteers.

In this section, we describe the characteristics of those who did come forward and were matched with adjudicated youth in this project. Data on mentors' basic demographic characteristics, collected from the mentor baseline survey and mentor applications, are presented in Table 3.

The two sites differed markedly in their gender ratios: in St. Louis, 58 percent of the mentors were women, while in Atlanta, men outnumbered women by more than two to one (68% to 32%). (Projectwide, 56% of the mentors were male.) Atlanta placed great emphasis, at least initially, on recruiting black men to mentor black boys; while St. Louis was less concerned with ensuring same-race/same-sex matches.

The majority of mentors at both sites were black (77% in St. Louis and 83% in Atlanta). The remaining mentors were predominantly white. Both programs' success in recruiting a large number of minority mentors contrasts with the experience of the well-established Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America (BB/BSA), which has had limited success in recruiting nonwhites (Furano et al., 1993).

TABLE 3

MENTOR CHARACTERISTICS

	ATLANTA	ST. LOUIS
Gender		
Male	68%	42%
Female	32	58
Race		
Black	83%	77%
White	16	20
Hispanic	0	1
Asian	1	0
Multi-ethnic	0	1
Age		
Range	22 to 76	20 to 62
Median	37	31
Marital Status		
Never married	35%	46%
Married	49	34
Separated/divorced	11	20
Widowed	4	0
Educational Background		
Less than high school	1%	0%
High school diploma	8	11
Some college	32	53
Four year college degree	30	29
Master's degree	18	5
Doctoral degree	10	3
NUMBER MATCHED	81	69

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Mentors ranged in age from 20 to 76, with a median age of 33. A majority of the mentors were single (55%); most of these had never married. Sixty-five percent of the mentors had one or more children.

Like the volunteers recruited in other mentoring programs, such as BB/BSA, the mentors recruited were predominantly from the middle class. The majority were employed (89%), and nearly half (44%) held professional or managerial jobs within their occupation. While 14 percent of the mentors had household incomes of less than $15,000, income of other mentors was fairly evenly distributed across the ranges of $15,000 to $60,000, with nearly 20 percent living in a household with a yearly income of $60,000 or higher. Very few mentors received any type of public assistance. Only one mentor did not graduate high school; nearly half (47%) were graduates of a four-year college. An additional 18 percent had advanced graduate degrees.

Overall, the mentors were an active group. The majority (69%) cited previous volunteer experience on their application or in their interview. A significant number (61%) also had volunteer experience working with youth.

On their applications and in interviews, mentors gave a variety of reasons for becoming involved in the project. In addition to feelings of community obligation and concern about youth crime, many mentors expressed concern for troubled youth and a desire to act as a positive role model. Mentors felt that the provision of social support could positively benefit these youth:

> I want to give something back [to the community] and I feel that these kids, the ones that are injured now . . . specifically the ones who sold drugs or [are] on the streets need somebody positive in their life. They just do. They're confronted every day with a lot of things that I couldn't even imagine and are negative . . . most of the people they come in contact with are negative. They don't see anything positive, so I just want to be a positive person . . . a role model for [my youth] (match 3, mentor).

The concern mentors felt for juvenile offenders did not mean they were not apprehensive about working directly with adjudicated youth. One mentor described how her fear of youth motivated her involvement and how her perception of adjudicated youth changed as a result:

> The reason I wanted to be a mentor is that I had gotten to the point where I was . . . afraid of seeing children just walking down the street. [I would] see them and . . . think, oh God, what are they gonna do to me. And I'm an adult and I thought now I've got to get a grip on this because these are just children and you shouldn't be afraid of children . . . Then when I [read about this program], I said this is a good opportunity to get involved with children first-hand. And so when I went to meet my mentee . . . here are

> these kids that's supposedly done all these terrible things . . . And they're walking around here with these stuffed animals and just, you know, playing . . . and so it lets you know that these are children, even though they're doing adult things. They're still children, emotionally and mentally and everything. And they just need help (match 5, mentor).

TRAINING

Both sites held training sessions for new mentors and ongoing matches. These training sessions varied widely in both content and quality. Some sessions focused on theories of communication and how to communicate effectively with youth; others focused on understanding African-American families. Responding to mentors' needs for specific information on the youth, later sessions tried to give mentors a clear picture of youth's lives in the facility and a better understanding of facility rules. Although mentors were generally expected to attend training before being matched, St. Louis did not consistently follow this policy.

MATCHING

At both sites, the application, screening and matching processes proved cumbersome. The average time from initial inquiry to match was three months, but this varied widely. While some mentors were matched one month after their initial inquiry, others waited five months or more.

Before being matched, mentors at both sites were required to complete initial applications, undergo a police check and be interviewed by staff. To facilitate the process of matching and coordinate match supervision, St. Louis appointed mentor coordinators at each facility and Atlanta appointed coordinators at the Lorenzo Benn YDC and in the community programs.

The number of people involved in the matching process differed at the two sites. In Atlanta, the process involved several staff members and was quite time-consuming. Initial match meetings typically involved the project director, the mentor coordinator, a representative from the District Office, aftercare workers, and caseworkers who worked with the youth on a daily basis. In St. Louis, matches were initially made by the project director, and later by the mentor coordinator at each facility. The mentor coordinators received a list of mentors available for their facility, consulted with group leaders about which youth would be best suited for the program, then made the matches.

In Atlanta, arranging meetings for all those involved in the matching process proved difficult. Consequently, Atlanta moved to a more decentralized system in which individual caseworkers were assigned greater responsibility for matching. However, even with decentralization, the timeliness of matching remained problematic. The caseworker was expected to find time in his or her schedule to examine the list of potential mentors, meet them, arrange a meeting time for the match and invite parents to attend. Absent some extraneous force pushing for matching to take place, the caseworkers fit matching into their oversubscribed schedules as best they could--but it was generally not a priority. During our final implementation site visit, the project director reported that 31 mentors were waiting to be matched (some of whom had attended training nearly a year earlier). Yet several staff stated their belief that there were no more available mentors. Given a decentralized system of matching, such breakdowns in communication are not surprising.

Match Variables

Both sites first made "paper matches" based on data from both the mentors and the youth. Mentor applications and interviews indicated their preferences for severity of offense, geographical proximity and mentor interests. Information on the youth was culled from youth application and interview forms. Because the relationship being established would not be naturally occurring, particular care was taken to identify common interests of the mentor and youth as a potential foundation on which a relationship might be established. The Atlanta site indicated that mentor preferences were sometimes a problem in matching--with some mentors requesting younger kids (who are scarce) or less serious offenders. However, once matched, caseworkers reported that those mentors whose preferences were not fulfilled were as good as those whose requests were met.

Gender and Race

The perceived needs of the youth were also considered in making matches. Initially, most caseworkers in Atlanta wanted male mentors to match with male youth who were absent a father, feeling the youth could benefit from a positive male role model. However, because of the large number of female mentors recruited, these staff ultimately made several cross-gender matches. These matches were found to be no more problematic than same-gender matches. At both sites, youth who had problems with women or did not have a strong mother (or any mother) in the home were considered good candidates for female mentors. Since twice as many males as females were recruited in Atlanta, 88 percent of its matches were same-gender. In contrast, 40 percent of St. Louis matches were cross-gender.

In Atlanta, which had particular success in targeting and attracting black male mentors, over half (54%) the mentors were black males, compared with 29 percent in St. Louis. Most matches at both sites were same-race (85% in Atlanta and 83% in St. Louis).

Geography

Geography was an issue--and a problem--in matching at both sites. Matches were made to maximize proximity between mentors and youth. At both sites, the bulk of recruitment was focused on the metropolitan area, with fewer mentors available for youth who lived in outlying counties. Because most St. Louis mentors lived closer to the downtown facility, it received the bulk of matches.

As a prerequisite for participating in the mentoring program, youth had to live in the St. Louis or Atlanta area, so the relationship could continue once the youth was released.[12] Staff at both sites noted that some youth who lived in other parts of the state--and who were even less likely than metropolitan youth to have consistent adult contact other than staff--requested mentors but were deemed ineligible due to geographic constraints.

Initial Meeting

Once the paper match was completed, a meeting was arranged involving the mentor, the youth, the staff person responsible for supervising the match and, when possible, the parent. (Parental involvement with incarcerated youth is often minimal, so in many cases, the mentor did not meet the parent until after the match was formalized.) Following this initial meeting, both mentors and youth had an opportunity to reject the match, though this option was rarely exercised by either party.

Staffing Issues

Involving in the matching process all parties who are knowledgeable about and have an interest in the youth and the mentoring program was a logistical nightmare. (In Atlanta, for example, match meetings could involve as many as five staff members.) In addition, coordinating the schedules of staff who work with the youth on an ongoing basis and those responsible for aftercare was difficult. Staff report that even in the absence of a mentoring program, it is difficult to arrange meetings between facility and aftercare workers to discuss such issues as the youth's release from the facility.

Aftercare workers were frequently not involved in the matching process and, in some cases, were not even notified when a youth on their caseload received a mentor. Finding out about the match from the youth, or several months after it occurred, generated feelings of exclusion and ill-will on the part of the aftercare worker. The coordination of schedules between agency staff, most of whom work a day shift, with mentors, who are generally available in the evening and on weekends, forced staff to go beyond their normal working hours to accommodate the program--without additional compensation. While such accommodations may be tolerable on an occasional basis, they generally become unacceptable when requested on a regular basis.

---

[12] An exception was made for some girls in Missouri who lived outside the St. Louis area.

Summary

The time between the mentors' initial contact with the program and the physical match was often quite protracted. At both sites, some mentors waited as long as five months to be matched, and some volunteers remained unmatched even after one year. Involvement of line staff in screening and matching of mentors and youth, while providing an opportunity for staff contribution to and investment in the project, stretched the matching process to a length that was intolerable to some volunteers. In addition, caseworkers noted they sometimes had difficulty locating mentors once the paper match had been made. While decentralization of matching is possible, supervision of the process is critical so that potential mentors are not lost while youth languish on waiting lists.

Recruitment and matching are critical and difficult first steps in implementing a mentoring program. The real test of implementation, however, comes in seeing whether the matches meet and last over time. Chapter IV addresses this test.

IV. EVALUATING IMPLEMENTATION

Mentoring programs are a unique social intervention in that the treatment they offer is an adult establishing a caring relationship with a child. A requisite for any mentoring program, then, is that the adult and youth meet regularly over time, allowing meaningful interaction to take place and the relationship to develop. While the fact that meetings take place does not, in and of itself, signify that an effective intervention is being delivered, meetings are a logical precondition for effective relationships. Both sites in this project asked adult volunteers to make a one-year commitment to meet weekly with their youth. And both of these factors--how often these matches met and how long they lasted--were the initial considerations in evaluating the success of the programs.

FREQUENCY OF MEETING AND LENGTH OF MATCH

Table 4 provides meeting frequency and length-of-match data for 157 of the 163 project matches. (Meeting frequency data were unavailable for six matches.) After analysis of mentor logs, survey data and program records, each match was assigned to one of four categories based on frequency of meeting: matches that met on three occasions or less during the life of the match; sporadic matches, defined as less than two times a month on average across the course of the relationship; regular, then sporadic matches that met at least twice a month for the first two months of the relationship before becoming less frequent; and regular matches that met, on average, at least twice a month over the course of the match. (See the Appendix for a more detailed discussion of these tabulations.)

Table 4 shows that nearly half of the matches (42%) met sporadically at best, and the majority of matches (62%) lasted six months or less. Thirty-one matches (20%) met three times or less, and 54 (34%) met for three months or less before ending. Only 41 matches (26%) met regularly for more than six months.

Considerable differences between the St. Louis and Atlanta programs were observed, as illustrated in Table 5. While half of the matches in St. Louis met regularly, more than half of those lasted three months or less. In Atlanta, there was a marked difference between matches originating at the Lorenzo Benn YDC (the facility-based matches) and those originating in community programming (community-based matches). The data show that the community-based matches met far less frequently than the Lorenzo Benn matches. Only 8 percent of the community-based matches met regularly over the course of the relationship, compared with over half of the facility-based matches.

Twenty-four matches in the demonstration (15%) were still meeting when we conducted follow-up interviews with either the mentor or the youth. Nine were community-based matches, 13 were matches that originated in the facility and successfully transitioned to the community, and two were meeting in the facility. All but four of these ongoing

TABLE 4

LENGTH OF MATCH BY FREQUENCY OF MEETING — ALL MATCHES

LENGTH	FREQUENCY OF MEETING				
	3 Times or Less	**Sporadic**	**Regular, then Sporadic**	**Regular**	**TOTAL**
3 Months or Less	22	7	1	24	54 (34%)
4 to 6 Months	7	12	10	15	44 (28%)
7 to 9 Months	1	5	10	7	23 (15%)
10+ Months	1	11	13	11	36 (23%)
TOTAL	31 (20%)	35 (22%)	34 (22%)	57 (36%)	157 (100%)

NOTE: Frequency of meeting was unavailable for six matches.
Matches in shaded areas defined as "sustained." (See text.)

TABLE 5

LENGTH OF MATCH BY FREQUENCY OF MEETING — SITE BREAKDOWN

St. Louis

LENGTH	FREQUENCY OF MEETING				
	3 Times or Less	**Sporadic**	**Regular, then Sporadic**	**Regular**	**TOTAL**
3 Months or Less	13	3	1	19	36 (47%)
4 to 6 Months	1	4	6	11	22 (29%)
7 to 9 Months	0	2	5	1	8 (10%)
10+ Months	0	1	4	6	11 (14%)
TOTAL	14 (18%)	10 (13%)	16 (21%)	37 (48%)	*77 (100%)*

Atlanta Facility-Based Matches

LENGTH	FREQUENCY OF MEETING				
	3 Times or Less	**Sporadic**	**Regular, then Sporadic**	**Regular**	**TOTAL**
3 Months or Less	3	1	0	3	7 (23%)
4 to 6 Months	0	2	3	4	9 (29%)
7 to 9 Months	0	0	2	5	7 (23%)
10+ Months	0	1	3	4	8 (26%)
TOTAL	3 (10%)	4 (13%)	8 (26%)	13 (52%)	*31 (100%)*

Atlanta Community-Based Matches

LENGTH	FREQUENCY OF MEETING				
	3 Times or Less	**Sporadic**	**Regular, then Sporadic**	**Regular**	**TOTAL**
3 Months or Less	6	3	0	2	11 (22%)
4 to 6 Months	6	6	1	0	13 (27%)
7 to 9 Months	1	3	3	1	8 (16%)
10+ Months	1	9	6	1	17 (35%)
TOTAL	14 (29%)	21 (43%)	10 (20%)	4 (8%)	*49 (100%)*

NOTE: Frequency of meeting was unavailable for six matches
Matches in shaded areas defined as "sustained." (See text.)

matches had been meeting 10 months or longer when the follow-up survey was administered.[13]

Sustained and Discontinued Relationships

Forty-one matches (26%) demonstrated some capability for sustained relationships. Although they did not all meet the initial longevity criteria of one year, these matches lasted more than six months and met on a regular basis for at least part of the match, if not through the entire relationship. These matches are found in the four shaded cells in Table 4. To reveal differences among relational patterns that contribute to relationships of longer duration and with greater meeting frequency, these matches--which we call "sustained" matches--are compared with the shorter and less frequently meeting matches--which we call "discontinued." Throughout this section, we use this analytical strategy to examine differences in all 163 matches studied through the baseline and follow-up surveys. This strategy is also used to distinguish the subset of 42 matches that were the focus of in-depth interviews.

No notable differences between sustained and discontinued matches were found with respect to age of mentor or youth, mentors' educational level, nor whether the match was cross- or same-race, or cross- or same-gender.[14]

Some suggestive findings were found on variables of gender and race. Female mentors were less likely than male mentors to be in sustained matches. Although the majority of male and female matches were involved in discontinued matches, 33 percent of the matches involving male mentors were sustained, compared with 15 percent of the matches involving female mentors. With respect to differences by race, we found that 13 (41%) of the 32 matches involving white youth were sustained, while 23 (19%) of the 96 matches with black youth were sustained. (The majority of these matches were same-race: 75 percent of the white youth were matched with white mentors and 94 percent of the black youth were matched with black mentors.)

This study was not designed to untangle the complex relationships and interactions between such variables as race, gender, family income, time availability and neighborhood resources, and their combined effects on meeting rates. Thus, we can offer no definitive explanation for why white youth were more likely than black youth to be in sustained matches. However, our data suggest that black youth's relationships were more likely than white youth's to end for reasons external to the mentoring relationship--matches involving black youth were more likely to terminate because the youth ran away or were reincarcerated. Thirteen matches involving black youth ended when the youth was incarcerated and five ended when the youth ran away. In contrast, no matches involving white youth ended for these reasons.

---

[13] Due to the extension of recruitment into Fall 1992, we were unable to wait one year to administer the follow-up survey to all mentors and youth who had not terminated.

[14] In this report, differences large enough to be worthy of discussion are measured by correlations exceeding .25.

Because the numbers in our study are small, these findings cannot be characterized as robust and should be interpreted with caution. For example, if three fewer matches involving white youth had been sustained, the percentage of sustained white matches would drop from 41 percent to 31 percent. Additional research with larger samples would be required to uncover whether significant gender and race differences exist and the reasons behind them. What is clear from our data is that the majority of matches--black and white, male and female--did not last or meet regularly.

What caused so many matches to meet so infrequently and end prematurely? According to our data sources (mentor logs, program records and mentor and youth follow-up surveys), matches met with much greater regularity while the youth were in the facility than after they were released. However, 36 of the 109 facility-based matches ended even before the youth left the facility. To understand how program practices and the unique challenges of the juvenile justice system may have affected mentor/youth interactions, we examine matches originating in facilities (facility-based matches), matches that successfully transitioned from the facility to the community (transitioned matches), and Atlanta matches originating in community-based programming (community-based matches). Reasons for termination of the matches overall--and by point of transition for facility-based matches--are presented in Table 6 and discussed in the following sections.

FACILITY-BASED MATCHES

A major goal of the mentoring program was to facilitate the youth's transition from the institution back to their community. We anticipated that the point of release would be a critical juncture in the mentoring relationship, and would pose significant challenges to both the mentor and youth for maintenance of the relationship. However, while we predicted that a substantial number of relationships would end at the transition point (as 22 of the 109 facility-based matches did), we could not foresee the significant proportion of relationships (33%) that ended before the youth even left the facility.

Mentors' Behavior

While youth are in the facility, they are, in essence, a captive audience with few choices about how they wish to spend their time. The dearth of leisure activities available to incarcerated youth, combined with the lack of visitors, made most youth eager to receive mentors. However, according to the completed mentor logs, mentors did not make it to 36 percent of scheduled weekly meetings.[15] In half of the cases in which meetings did

---

[15] Logs noting that mentors and youth failed to meet were completed for 490 weeks and mentors gave reasons for not meeting on 436 of these logs. Percentages are based on these 436 logs.

TABLE 6

REASONS MATCHES TERMINATED

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	FACILITY-BASED MATCHES			COMMUNITY-BASED MATCHES
		Before Discharge	**At Point of Discharge**	**After Discharge**	
Mentor stopped coming/too busy	40 (30%)	17 (47%)	5 (23%)	5 (16%)	13 (29%)
Youth didn't want relationship to continue	20 (15%)	2 (6%)	5 (23%)	8 (25%)	5 (11%)
Mentor/youth moved	18 (13%)	4 (11%)	5 (23%)	7 (22%)	2 (4%)
Lost contact	11 (8%)	1 (3%)	5 (23%)	3 (9%)	2 (4%)
Youth in detention[a]	15 (11%)	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)	10 (22%)
Youth ran away	5 (4%)	1 (3%)	—	—	4 (9%)
One year was up	5 (4%)	1 (3%)	—	3 (9%)	1 (2%)
Other[b]	21 (16%)	7 (19%)	1 (5%)	5 (16%)	8 (18%)
Total number of matches[c]	135	36	22	32	45

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

[a] For matches that terminated before discharge, detention refers to isolation rooms where youth were placed when their behavior constituted a danger to others. Detention for matches in the community refers to temporary holding facilities.

[b] "Other" includes such responses as the mentor felt unsupported by the staff, the mentor felt the youth was not improving, the mentor and youth got into an argument, the mentor and youth drifted apart, and the youth lived too far from the mentor after release.

[c] Four terminated matches are excluded from this analysis. Two are missing discharge dates, and two were paper-matched in the facility, but first met after release from the institution. Twenty-four matches were ongoing: 9 community-based matches, 13 transitioned matches and 2 matches still in the facility.

not occur in the facility, mentors reported they were too busy or simply did not show up (31%), or they were out of town (22%). Mentors often reported that work accounted for their being too busy. They also did not meet with their youth because of illness (5%) or transportation problems (3%).

Similarly, when matches terminated before the youth was released from the facility, the most common reason was that the mentor stopped showing up or was too busy to continue the relationship (47%). (See Table 6.) In some cases, neither the youth nor the caseworker knew why the mentor stopped coming and attempts to contact the mentor were unfruitful. Only two facility-based matches terminated before the youth was released because the youth did not want the relationship to continue.[16]

According to our analysis of in-depth interviews with participants representing 42 matches, adults in discontinued matches were more likely than adults in sustained matches, (those meeting regularly and lasting over six months) to give little or no explanation when they stopped meeting with their youth. In seven of the 22 discontinued matches interviewed, adult volunteers abruptly stopped visiting their youth, leaving the youth to contact them; this behavior only occurred once in the 20 sustained matches interviewed. When mentors failed to show up or abruptly stopped meeting with their youth without explanation, youth were disappointed:

> I used to call her and ask her is she gonna come . . . It was sort of like she was setting me up, like she'll say for sure I'm gonna be up here on this day. And that day will come and I'll [think], no, she ain't comin', [and] she would never come. So I'd call again . . . [and] she'd have an excuse like my daughter . . . but this kept on goin' on, she had an excuse. So finally I told [the caseworker] and she said . . . I'll try to get you another mentor . . . That's how it was, I stopped calling her, [and] she never did come, she never did call or nothing like that (match 41, youth).

In another case, the child blamed herself for her mentor's absence. In the following exchange with the interviewer, she explains how she and the other girls in her facility reasoned why some adults were inconsistent in showing up for visits:

> Youth: I heard my [caseworker] talking to her on the phone, and then I knew I had one but . . . she hadn't been coming up . . . And then she finally came up [and] . . . explained everything to me and that made me feel like okay, well maybe I didn't do anything wrong.
>
> Interviewer: You felt like you had done something wrong?

---

[16] Reasons other matches terminated include the mentor or youth moving, the youth running away, completion of the one-year programmatic obligation or the youth being in detention.

> Youth: Yeah . . . because everybody was saying well [the mentors] . . . want [girls with] blue eyes and blond hair and tall and skinny or something. So I was like well maybe . . . I'm chunky and . . . and she doesn't want me (match 11, youth).

Even when mentors did meet regularly with their youth, missed meetings did not go unnoticed. One youth gave this account:

> I was like man, I was just walkin' around the room, man, she should be coming, she should be coming. A man walked out, what time is it, it's 1:30, man, she should be coming 'cause it's visiting hour one to two. Man walked up again, I just told you what time it is, what time it is, 1:45. Ten minutes later, everybody's coming in for visitation and I'm sittin' there, oh, man, oh, she said she was gonna come (match 4, youth).

As discussed in Chapter II, this population of youth has accumulated numerous disappointing experiences involving adults. Thus, the consequences of these behaviors on the part of these well-intentioned adult volunteers--meeting with the youth inconsistently or ending relationships abruptly--are undoubtedly detrimental. The potential harm wrought by inconsistent mentors must be weighed against the potential good of the program in considering its usefulness for implementation in other jurisdictions.

Institutional Barriers to Meeting

Although missed meetings and early terminations may be due partly to inadequate screening procedures that failed to weed out mentors who lacked commitment to the program, other program practices and institutional barriers contributed to the problem. These include the mentor's limited access to the youth, facility rules and regulations, and lack of supervision.

Limited Access

One senior manager noted that "limiting access" is a major function of a juvenile justice facility. By design, the system limits youth's access to the outside world; less intentionally, the system also limits outsiders' access to the youth. As many youth have committed serious crimes, public safety is a concern of the system. Thus, institutional practices can at times contribute to non-meeting. In St. Louis, 7 percent of weekly meetings did not occur because the youth was not allowed to receive visitors--in most cases, because the youth's group was on restriction. Nearly one-fifth (19%) of the mentors in St. Louis experienced this problem at least once. In approximately 10 percent of the cases at both sites, the meeting did not take place because the youth was either too busy or was out on a pass. Since a youth's time is largely controlled by the institution, being "too busy" largely reflects institutional priorities for the youth--including filling their treatment needs.

Set visiting hours also limited mentors' access to youth. While Atlanta relaxed its rules about visiting hours to allow mentors flexibility in coming to the institution, mentors in St. Louis were restricted to visiting their youth during the two days per week set aside for all visitors. The presence of an established weekly meeting time did seem to encourage more consistent visiting for some mentors; however, when mentors were unable to meet on the designated visiting days, the policy allowed no opportunity to make up the missed meeting.

Rules and Regulations

The restrictions of the institutional environment precluded implementation of many aspects of traditional mentoring programs. One of the biggest challenges faced by mentors was the lack of activities in which they could participate with their youth. Depending on the youth's security level, meetings could be restricted to one room of the facility. At both sites, recreational activities were very limited; thus, even youth who were awarded freer access (e.g., the ability to walk around the campus without a staff member) had few activity options available. Devising activities within the restricted institutional setting was generally left to the mentors' imagination. While mentors did invent some creative activities (one mentor brought a golf ball, club and tee, and taught his youth how to play golf), their imaginations were quickly exhausted by the institutional constraints. Facility rules often limited the type of gifts mentors were allowed to bring youth, which further constrained the range of possible activities. One facility prohibited the playing of cards, effectively killing one mentor's planned activity for her visit. Another mentor described her frustration:

> There's just so many constraints to being in that facility. There's not a lot to do. I said well listen I have some dominoes, we can do that. Or once I brought all the magazines that I had . . . but really, we haven't done a lot (match 9, mentor).

Thus, the primary activity engaged in by mentors and youth was talking, though even conversational interaction was subject to limits. At some St. Louis facilities, youth with visitors were required to have other youth present in the room, listening to the conversation while the mentor and youth interacted. This practice, called "three aware," is designed to prevent youth from lying to visitors. Some mentors were uncomfortable with this arrangement and felt a tension between spending time talking with their youth and trying to engage the other youth in conversation. This mentor expressed concern that her youth was disturbed by the interruptions of other youth required to listen in on their visit:

> [Other youth would] want to sit in on our groups and whatever, and they would say, you're my mentor too . . . And sometimes, other people would overtake the conversation and they wouldn't let [my youth] talk, and it's like I had to [say to my youth] "what are you thinking? How come you

> aren't participating in this conversation" . . . and bring him into the conversation . . . And I could see sometimes that he was maybe jealous or [thinking] "This is my mentor. You all go away somewhere. Leave me alone" (match 35, mentor).

Although many mentors were initially told they would be allowed to take their youth off campus, such excursions were frequently prohibited. Youth in both Atlanta and St. Louis facilities were required to reach the highest level in their four-step level system before off-campus visits could be granted. Reaching this level entailed completing certain treatment requirements; because youth were in treatment, many regularly fluctuated between being ready for release and having all privileges revoked. As two youth explain:

> I had got my third level and then . . . me and another group member, we got into a conflict and I [was demoted to] Level One--that's when you don't have no activities with the group and stuff. And then I had got [promoted] off that. And then we got back into a conflict and then I got my level dropped (match 3, youth).

> It was really like my third month here I was doing real good and I was gonna live with my [aunt] . . . I asked for my Level Four and then they said no I couldn't have it 'cause I was manipulating the group. I didn't see none of this, the group didn't see none of that and I was just on top of everything. But the staff said no I wasn't. So they didn't give me Level Four and that just brought me way down and I stopped eating, I stopped drinking, I stopped doing everything, I just didn't wanna be here anymore. So then on I just didn't do nothing (match 11, youth).

Even obtaining Level Four did not ensure an off-campus visit--youth also had to gain the staff members' trust. As this staff member explains:

> A lot of the kids who are . . . involved in the mentor program, they may be high risk, run risk or . . . they have escaped before . . . So we would have to really build up a high trust level with that particular kid in order to let him [go off-campus with his mentor].

Not surprisingly, this rule greatly affected mentor/youth interactions. According to the mentor survey, 60 percent of the facility matches never went off campus and 20 percent went off campus only once or twice. One mentor expressed great frustration with the limitations of the facility and restrictions in going off campus:

> In the facility it was hard to do anything . . . I think I showed the facility that I could be trusted and I think--even when [my youth] got on the fourth step . . . when you can get outside privileges--they never gave them to him (match 25, mentor).

These restrictions largely prevented matches from taking part in the more traditional "fun" activities associated with other mentoring programs. Previous research suggests that "fun" is a significant factor in the formation of effective mentoring relationships (Styles and Morrow, 1992). However, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter V, this particular population of youth expressed great interest in having someone come to visit and talk with them--an activity that this program, on some level, was able to provide.

Supervision

The only adults with whom institutionalized youth have consistent contact are staff members, whose responsibilities limit time for one-on-one attention. Indeed, much of the rationale for introducing adult mentors to the justice system was that staff were already overtaxed; however, limited staff time also precluded the establishment of effective supervisory procedures. Staff members felt their time was fully subscribed before the introduction of the mentoring program--adding to their responsibilities was generally not viewed in a positive light.

For both agencies, understaffing was a problem. In Atlanta, layoffs implemented prior to the introduction of the mentoring program resulted in increased caseloads for remaining staff. In St. Louis, some facilities experienced a high level of staff turnover, resulting in chronic understaffing.

Due to the limited resources afforded the juvenile justice system for programs like mentoring, the original program model in Atlanta decentralized supervision to the caseworkers responsible for monitoring the youth's progression through the system from adjudication to aftercare. Focusing on the possible benefits of continuity of supervision, a particular staff member--the aftercare caseworker--was assigned to maintain contact with both the mentor and youth. This model of supervision, however, proved unworkable. Although youth are assigned an aftercare worker when first committed to the system, this person typically has limited contact with youth before their release from the facility. Most mentors felt they needed contact with staff who interacted with the youth on a more regular basis, and could provide updates on the youth's progress and suggest ways to cope with problems that arose.

Further, because the mentors and aftercare workers rarely met face-to-face, mentors had to rely on telephone contact. Mentors said the aftercare workers were extremely difficult to reach, as their heavy caseloads frequently kept them away from their desk or out of the office. When these problems became apparent, Atlanta reassigned supervision to staff within the facility, a supervision pattern similar to that followed in St. Louis from the beginning.

In St. Louis, each facility had a designated "mentor coordinator" who participated in recruitment, screening and matching and was largely responsible for supervision. This person was typically a youth specialist, the most junior staff position at the facility.

Mentor coordinators were to receive compensatory time for their participation in the mentoring program as an incentive to assume this additional responsibility. However, their junior position often meant that they would get pulled away from their mentoring responsibilities when staff shortages arose. Because "mentor coordinator" was not necessarily part of the youth specialists' job description, their supervisors perceived their participation to be voluntary and secondary to their youth specialist duties. For some mentor coordinators, the decision to participate was only partly voluntary--they were approached about taking the position with the expectation that they would accept.

When Atlanta appointed a mentor coordinator for the Lorenzo Benn YDC, it named a senior staff member. But when staff shortages arose, she too was pulled away from her mentoring responsibilities.

Mentor coordinators in both St. Louis and Atlanta became the primary contact for mentors. Many took a particular interest in the program and enjoyed initiating contact with the mentors--in fact, many used free time to match adult volunteers and youth and supervise the pairs. In addition, mentor coordinators were often on hand to meet mentors during their visits. Because these mentor coordinators were typically extraordinary staff members, they were frequently promoted to other positions within the system. Thus, the mentor coordinator position saw considerable turnover over the course of the demonstration, leaving matches unattended during the coordinator's transfer of responsibilities to a new staff member.

When mentors visited the facility, they generally were able to talk to a staff member knowledgeable about the youth, in addition to the mentor coordinator. Staff members were generally willing to talk to mentors about their youth's progress in the program. However, when mentors failed to show up, staff were reluctant to assume the burden of contacting the mentor to find out why they did not visit.

TRANSITIONED AND COMMUNITY-BASED MATCHES

Of the facility-based matches that did not terminate before the youth was released, 22 ended when the youth was released and 45 matches made the transition from the facility to the community--meaning that these matches met at least once in the community after the youth's release.[17] According to mentor log data, the transitioned matches met less frequently in the community than in the facility. While in the facility, almost all these matches met regularly. In the community, one-quarter of the transitioned matches continued to meet regularly, one-quarter met three times or less before terminating, and the rest either met sporadically, or met regularly immediately following release and less frequently thereafter. A much higher proportion of transitioned matches than community-based matches met regularly once the youth was released (approximately 25% versus 8%), but the majority of matches in both groups experienced problems meeting while in the community. Here, we examine the circumstances that precluded regular meetings in the community for both transitioned matches and community-based matches.

---

[17] Six matches are excluded from this tabulation. At the time data collection concluded, two matches were still meeting in the facility, two were missing discharge dates, and two matches arranged in the facility first met after the youth's release from the institution.

According to mentor log data, while matches were based in the institution, the mentor was more likely to be responsible for missed meetings. Although mentor-related reasons (e.g., too busy, out of town, illness and transportation problems) still accounted for a significant number of non-meetings (37%) among transitioned and community-based matches, their reasons for not meeting were more often directly attributable to the individual youth and this special population of youth.[18] In nearly one-quarter of these cases, the mentor reported that the youth was directly responsible for the meeting not taking place, either by being too busy (14%) or out of town (3%), or simply failing to show up for the meeting (6%). In nearly 30 percent of the cases, the reasons transitioned and community-based matches did not meet reflect the special characteristics of this population. For example, 10 percent of meetings were missed because the youth was being held in secure detention facilities.[19] Youth were also unavailable to meet because they had run away (7%), had been sent to another facility or program (4%), or simply could not be contacted by the mentor (8%).

Although most matches that transitioned to the community had met regularly while in the facility, their difficulties in meeting outside the facility mirrored those faced by community-based matches. These include: lack of aftercare and supervision, transience in youth's lives, and youth's problems with the law that result in their reincarceration. All these factors underscore the difficulty of implementing a mentoring program for adjudicated youth.

Aftercare and Supervision of Transitioned and Community-Based Matches

Both agencies acknowledged that the provision of aftercare is the weakest link in their system. Following release from the institution, youth were required to maintain regular contact with an aftercare worker and fulfill certain agreed-on "conditions of placement," such as attending school, obtaining employment and refraining from criminal activity. Unfortunately, many youth had infrequent contact with aftercare workers. Typically, the transfer of supervision of the match from the mentor coordinator to the aftercare worker did not occur; where it did, the worker often saw neither mentor nor youth with enough regularity to monitor the progress of the relationship.

---

[18] Calculations are based on the 2,518 weekly mentor logs reporting that transitioned or community-based matches did not meet and giving a reason for not meeting. An additional 307 logs indicated that matches did not meet but gave no reason.

[19] Youth are sent to these detention centers after they have been arrested and are awaiting trial and/or placement following adjudication.

The lack of a strong aftercare system meant that on release, many youth effectively severed ties with the system, at least temporarily. It might be that for youth who perceived the mentor as part of the juvenile justice system, exiting the system also meant exiting the relationship. In the absence of structure for meeting places, times and activities, many relationships floundered.

It is reasonable to assume that some youth requested mentors while institutionalized as a means of "working the system" or of addressing needs specific to their experience of incarceration. Nearly a quarter of the relationships that ended either at discharge or once the youth transitioned terminated because the youth did not want the relationship to continue. In the absence of an aftercare system, youth had no obligation to continue to meet with their mentor. One mentor reported:

> She was never at home and she never returned my calls. I got the impression that she really didn't want a mentor, she just did it to do what she needed to do to get out of there (match 33, mentor).

Youth whose matches originated in Court Service Offices--the equivalent of probation--met less frequently than all other matches. Youth assigned to a CTC or alternative school were matched more successfully than were youth assigned to the Court Service Office. The large caseloads (averaging 85 youth) of the caseworkers in the Court Service Office made it difficult for them to provide mentors, as well as youth, with necessary supervision. Therefore, Atlanta stopped matching youth in this setting.

Some mentors were frustrated with the lack of support and supervision they received from caseworkers, as illustrated by this mentor's comments:

> I need more than you to tell me "you haven't filled out your green form [mentor log]" . . . I need some help, like I needed some help when he first got out and nobody heard it (match 12, mentor).

Perhaps due to this lack of guidance, mentors often made critical mistakes. According to our analysis of the 42 in-depth interviews, a characteristic of matches that met sporadically and terminated prematurely was that the adult volunteers, unsure of the youth's feelings about the relationship, were more likely to test whether the youth valued their role. These adults would assess the youth's interest in meeting with them by expecting the youth to initiate telephone contact. This testing behavior occurred in both community-based and transitioned matches. Seven mentors in the 22 discontinued matches interviewed expected the youth to call them, compared with only one in the 20 sustained matches. One mentor, whose youth was released from the facility two weeks before the interview, waited that period of time for his youth to call him:

> Before he left . . . I said here's my phone number. If you'd like for me to continue our relationship as a mentor, I'd be glad to, but you will have to

> call me so that I'll know that you're interested. So I never heard anything [until last night] (match 34, mentor).

According to program records, this match ended during the month following the interview.

Another adult volunteer articulated why the expectation for youth to call is unrealistic--having learned that youth have great difficulty calling their mentors and leaving messages on answering machines. Unfortunately, his revelation came too late, and at the expense of the child, as the match was already in decline:

> I started thinking about the situation, and--this was later--that there are some young people who in their past experiences have not been motivated in that way to just respond. To just get on the telephone and call. That has not been their orientation in the past . . . And I thought about that and I said, gee, that may have been his problem . . . he may have been enjoying me . . . but he just really had a problem in . . . picking up the phone. That he may have even tried--and you know, even once I felt that he may have called me, but didn't say anything. Because on the night that I was expecting a call on one particular occasion there was a call that came in . . . and I said, hello, and there was no voice. So he may have [called], but just got lost . . . for words to say. But I did call him the next night, just to see how he was doing, and he said he was doing fine. So he never told me that he may have tried to call (match 28, mentor).

An adult's belief that the youth's not calling signifies dissatisfaction with the relationship has been expressed frequently in other P/PV studies of mentoring programs. However, in both BB/BS and Linking Lifetimes agencies, program staff use the initial training and ongoing supervision to stress to mentors that they are the adult in the relationship, and that the primary responsibility for developing and maintaining the relationship is theirs. In contrast, caseworkers in the juvenile justice project sometimes encouraged mentors to place responsibility for maintaining contact with the youth, in the belief that this would encourage the development of responsible behavior. Some caseworkers would make the youth responsible for maintaining weekly or monthly contact with them and suggested to mentors that they do the same. However, youth did not often take this initiative and their failure to call jeopardized the mentoring relationship.

As with the facility-based matches, supervision of community-based matches varied by caseworker. One staff member at a CTC took a particular interest in the mentoring program, maintaining daily contact with mentors, and arranging monthly dinners where mentors could discuss their struggles and successes working with their youth. Similarly, other caseworkers made efforts to work closely with at least one mentor. Unfortunately, the mentors who were not persistent in maintaining contact with staff were likely to drop off.

Transience

The youth involved in this project were difficult to contact, highly mobile and often lived in homes without working phones. As one mentor noted:

> See [my youth] moved around so much. He was staying with his, I think his aunt, then he started staying with his mother and then his uncle, then back to his aunt (match 24, mentor).

The obstacles we encountered in trying to locate youth for the follow-up survey attest to the difficulty mentors had in contacting these youth.[20] Nearly one-quarter of the 22 relationships that terminated when the youth was released did so because the mentor and youth lost contact with one another. One mentor was able to keep in contact with his youth primarily because the youth came to him:

> It's hard to keep track of these kids. Most of the times when I keep track of [my youth] is when he come to me. Because every time I try to get to him, he's not around. And then by his mom not having a phone . . . when I finally say, well, let me drive over there, he's not there, you know. A couple of times, [my youth] has come over my house 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning. You know, I'm like what are you even doing out this time of night, you know, this is a school night? Well . . . I just needed to talk to you and I know how you work all the time and this is the only time I thought I could catch you in. And I got problems with this and my brother being shot and my mom, you know, she's still laid off (match 29, mentor).

Due to the inadequacies of the aftercare system, aftercare workers often were unable to contact the youth themselves and could provide little assistance to the mentors.

Youth's Problems with the Law

A frequent reason for the demise of community-based matches was the incarceration of the youth. Ten of the 45 terminated community-based matches (22%), ended either because the mentor could not meet with the youth due to detention facility regulations or because the mentor did not want to meet with the youth once she or he was locked up again. Although detention regulations often stipulated that only family members were allowed to visit the youth, persistent mentors were often able to gain access to their youth through caseworker channels. This mentor describes a typical period of loss of contact due to the youth's new placement:

---

[20] We were unable to reach 89 youth (55%). In 34 percent of the cases of nonrespondents, the contact phone number had been disconnected, had been changed to an unpublished number, was wrong or was never answered. In 13 percent of the cases, the youth had no telephone at home. For 11 percent of the youth, the information we were able to secure from parents, guardians and caseworkers was simply "whereabouts unknown." Eight percent of the nonresponding youth did live with their parents but could never be reached at home when we called, despite being called upward of 20 times at different times of the day and evening, and on weekends. In another 10 percent of the cases, the youth did not live at the number of the contact person (typically a parent, girlfriend, grandmother or other relative) but only stopped by sporadically and had no permanent address with a phone.

> Sometimes I'd see her two times [a week], sometimes three, what have you. We were seeing each other very frequently until she went into the girl's home . . . Since then it's been limited . . . [When they] put her in the girl's home I couldn't see her at all for a period of time because they had a probationary period . . . she must have done something cause they extended it. And the last time I saw [her] was [a month ago] (match 26, mentor).

Some mentors refused to see their youth when they went into temporary detention. One mentor said the following:

> He had gotten in some trouble and was in a locked up facility again . . . for about two to three weeks . . . and I just said to him . . . I wasn't visiting him and he knew that, that if he got locked up again I was not visiting him . . . but we'd still be friends, he could call me. I let his mother know that he could call me but I wasn't visiting (match 19, mentor).

These factors--lack of supervision, youth's transience and continued delinquency--may also have contributed to volunteers' decisions to leave the program. Mentors who found themselves unable or unwilling to make the long-term commitment to the program accounted for the largest percentage of terminations (29 percent) among the 45 terminated community-based matches, and was a reason for termination in 16 percent of the 32 transitioned matches that ended.

Summary

Matches encountered problems that interfered with meeting both in the facility and in the community. Facility rules limited the activities available to mentors and youth, and the time during which they could meet. Many relationships ended before the youth was released because the mentors left the program. Matches that transitioned from the facility and those that originated in the community experienced a range of problems that contributed to missed meetings and premature terminations, including youth transience and reincarceration. In both the facility and community, the lack of a strong program infrastructure contributed to the high percentage of missed meetings and early terminations.

PARTICIPANTS' AND STAFF MEMBERS' VIEWS OF THE PROGRAM

The merit of mentoring initiatives is measured not only by the success of implementation but by participants' satisfaction with the program. This section describes how the participants and staff members viewed the program.

Mentors

Overall, mentors liked and believed in the program, with 80 percent of the mentors who completed the follow-up survey reporting they had tried to recruit other adults to volunteer. However, even supportive mentors expressed concern with the limited amount of training and supervision provided.

Nearly all the mentors attended at least one orientation or training session, with 75 percent attending two or more. However, mentors' assessment of the training was mixed. Suggestions for improved training were similar in the two sites. Mentors expressed a desire for ongoing training, and a need for more concrete, usable information on the institution and the youth. Although most mentors felt it was appropriate for training sessions to focus on issues of cultural sensitivity and theories of communication, they reported that their most immediate needs were to know the rules of the facility, whether they can take the youth off campus and how permission is granted to do so, and how their role as mentor fits into the existing institutional structure. They also wanted more detail about their youth's background and family life, and how to deal with specific problematic situations that might arise. Some suggested role-playing as a way to reinforce the ideas presented during training. Aside from the mentors in St. Louis who were staff members of MDCYS, mentors knew very little about the juvenile justice system and came into the program with very little idea of what mentoring a youth in this setting would entail.

Concerning supervision, mentors expressed frustration with their inability to contact staff members. Said one mentor:

> I was wondering what would it take to get the caseworkers more involved. I mean if a kid has volunteered--now these kids volunteered also to participate in the mentor program, if they did that, that's a first step toward bettering themselves. They should at least, you know, try and work with them, work with the program (match 30, mentor).

At both sites--but not at all locations--support groups were made available for mentors. Most mentors surveyed (85%) said they had been invited to attend a support group meeting. Over half (66%) said they attended at least once and the vast majority (90%) found these groups helpful. Over half the mentors (65%) felt that they did not have enough contact with other mentors, indicating a desire for a forum in which shared experiences could be discussed. Another common complaint was the lack of structure:

> I was expecting a little bit more structure involving the mentors and the people that run the program. And I guess that's what's lacking. I think we need to meet once a month, once every six weeks, once every eight weeks for updates, what the organization expects of us and what we expect of them. That way, I think maybe the program would be more beneficial (match 14, mentor).

Mentors' perceptions of whether they helped their youth varied. While only 15 percent of mentors surveyed said they felt they helped their youth a great deal, nearly half (45%) felt they had helped their youth somewhat. Thirty-one percent felt they helped a little and only 9 percent felt they did not help at all. Mentors' estimates of how much they helped their youth did not differ significantly between sustained and discontinued matches. Analyses of in-depth interviews indicate that adults in both sustained and discontinued matches expected the youth to "transform," and felt that anything short of such transformation was their failure. As these three mentors report:

> I would like to see the kid get on the right track, I really would. Because then I would think that I have accomplished something. And I don't like to lose, do you understand that? I really don't like to lose. And I think if this kid come home and get into something else, then I've lost (match 4, mentor).
>
> I'm not gonna lie to you. I have not been successful with [my youth], you know, I'm just gonna tell you point blank. Because to me, success is him not being associated with gang activity, him not putting himself in a situation where he can be shot (match 29, mentor).
>
> And I wanted to see her turn her life around (match 9, mentor).

This expectation may account for the fairly high percentage (40%) of mentors who felt they helped their youth very little or not at all.

Moreover, even when mentors felt they could provide some positive support to youth, their help could not compensate for the negative influences found in youth's communities. This mentor describes his youth's community as a "war zone":

> Well it's like . . . he loves me, he looks at me more so than he looks at his own father. And . . . he wants so much to please me, he wants to please me more than he wanna please his own self. But it's like okay, here I am with [my mentor] over in . . . this nice area and [my mentor] takes me to these nice events . . . But [my mentor] has to drop me back off over here where my mom stays at . . . and in that environment . . . there's gang activity, drug activity . . . I mean he has to resort back to his old survival techniques. When he comes around me, he can let his guard down [sigh], you

> know. But once that five or six or seven hours is up, it's like well . . . I'm back off to the war zone, you know what I'm saying? (match 29, mentor).

Youth

Although the majority of matches did not meet regularly or last a year, youth who completed the follow-up survey or were the target of in-depth interviews responded positively to program participation. All but three of the 72 youth completing the follow-up survey said they would recommend the program to another adjudicated youth; the vast majority (87%) said they would recommend their mentor to another youth; and a majority (62%) said they would like to see their mentor at least once a week in the next year. Further, most of these youth (87%) characterized their relationship with their mentor as close. Given the small number of youth who participated in the follow-up survey (45% of the total), these findings may reflect biases of self-selection, and thus may not be generalizable to the entire sample. However, we also found that all 25 youth who participated in the in-depth interviews responded positively to the program and identified ways in which their mentor was helpful to them.

Youth in both sustained and discontinued matches responded positively to the program. Although we can offer no definitive explanation for this phenomenon, we hypothesize that given the lack of individualized attention these youth receive, they were appreciative of any adult who showed an interest in them--even if meetings were not regular.

Indeed, interviews with facility staff, youth and mentors indicate that the youth's satisfaction with the program largely reflected their tremendous need for adult attention. In perhaps one of the most telling findings, nearly half of the 72 youth surveyed (46%) said that they did not talk to another adult about the topics most frequently discussed with their mentor--how things are going in school, fun things the youth and adult would like to do together, and how things are going in DYS. Further, staff, mentors and youth interviewed often spoke of the other youth in the system who wanted mentors. One staff member said:

> Kids that don't have mentors are like, "when am I gonna get my mentor, I want a mentor, you know."

Staff

We interviewed staff at all levels about their participation in and perceptions of the mentoring program. With few exceptions, staff were enthusiastic about the program--provided they were not responsible for supervision. As discussed earlier, staff were resistant to expanding their current responsibilities to include mentoring. Although staff did not mind talking to mentors about the youth, they did not want to be responsible for making follow-up calls to check on the status of the relationship, to initiate contact with mentors who failed to show up, or to collect mentor logs. The number of mentored youth on caseworkers' caseloads varied considerably. But even those with as few as two mentors reported feeling burdened by the extra responsibility.

Nearly all staff felt that youth on their caseloads benefitted from having mentors; some cited higher self-esteem and fewer behavioral problems among mentored youth. In addition, some staff felt that youth reaped benefits just by having the mentor as a role model and by having increased exposure to activities and cultural events beyond their everyday experience.

BENEFITS TO THE SYSTEM

One hypothesized benefit of the mentoring program was that mentors would aid caseworkers by providing additional supervision and support for the youth. By and large, this outcome was not achieved. In fact, as noted earlier, staff found that supervision of the relationship added an unwelcome level of responsibility to their job.

Ambivalence about the mentors' roles within the juvenile justice system resulted in uneven integration practices. Some staff members saw the mentor as a treatment resource for the youth, incorporated mentoring into the youth's treatment plan and discussed that treatment plan with the mentor. Other staff felt the mentor was more appropriately considered extraneous to institutional treatment. These staff purposely maintained distance from the relationship and disassociated the mentor from the system, wanting the youth to view their mentor as a friend and not another arm of juvenile justice. Staff's ambivalence meant that some mentors were more informed than others about the youth's treatment. Half the mentors reported that they were unfamiliar with their youth's treatment plan, and therefore could not provide support for it.

The mentoring program did benefit the St. Louis site, in particular, by generating an enhanced public image for MDCYS. Once a very closed system, MDCYS became much more visible in the community and more open to the public as networks were forged with other community agencies and organizations. Some staff reported higher internal morale as MDCYS was recognized in the community as a youth-serving rather than a strictly punitive system. One aftercare worker in St. Louis spoke positively about the publicity the program received:

> [The mentoring program] makes me feel good about DYS. DYS doesn't have a good name with the court system. It's more to us than incarcerated children.

GDCYS was already considered a more open system, evidenced by its existing relationship with the NAACP and its established volunteer programs (including Foster Grandparents) in the residential facility.

Another benefit to St. Louis was an improved climate on visiting days, due to the presence of mentors who provided some outside contact for all youth, not just their assigned mentees. Several staff members noted that many youth never or only sporadically received visits from family members. One staff member estimated that 30 percent of the youth in her facility never received visitors, while 40 percent received them occasionally. Only 30 percent had weekly visits.

Finally, staff in both St. Louis and Atlanta felt that the influx of volunteers could potentially contribute to a greater understanding of the difficulty of the agencies' jobs and the need for a greater allocation of resources to the system, a benefit independent of the effectiveness of the mentoring program.

It is clear that implementing a successful mentoring program for this population is difficult and resource-intensive. The youth served by this program are a population much more at risk than youth found in most other mentoring programs; the institutional constraints of the juvenile justice system presented additional barriers. Despite the bleak picture of match longevity and meeting frequency overall, staff members, mentors and youth responded positively to the program, and one-quarter of the matches demonstrated some capacity for sustained relationships. The characteristics of these sustained matches, and the ways in which they differed from discontinued ones, are the topic of Chapter V.

V. CHARACTERISTICS OF SUSTAINED MATCHES

As discussed in Chapter IV, one-quarter of the 163 matches (41 pairs) demonstrated some capacity for sustaining relationships. To understand more about why these pairs were successful in meeting regularly while others failed, the transcripts from interviews representing 20 sustained pairs and 22 discontinued pairs were content-analyzed.[21] The analysis focused on determining whether any differences could be detected between the styles of interaction employed by adults in sustained versus discontinued relationships. Several distinguishing patterns were found, and are detailed in this chapter. First, however, we examine how youth describe what they value in a relationship.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPPORTIVE ADULTS AND PEERS

The 25 youth interviewed identified a variety of people who provide support in their lives: 19 mentioned siblings or other relatives, 14 mentioned friends, 12 mentioned parents and 11 mentioned DYS staff.[22] When asked how these individuals were supportive, youth identified a small set of characteristics common to all of these relationships. Supportive individuals were described as (a) caring; (b) reliable, or in their words, someone they know who is always "there" for them when they need help; and (c) someone with whom they feel comfortable talking about personal problems or concerns, and who will give them honest advice and/or reliable information. The following is a typical description of a supportive person, given by a young man describing his older brother:

> He always helps me when I need him . . . and he [is] still there when I don't need him (match 14, youth).

When youth were asked why they wanted a mentor, they gave similar responses, reporting that they wanted someone to care about them:

> Somebody you can trust and talk to and you be feeling good because you can have somebody, you know, somebody that care about you and spend time (match 10, youth).
>
> I've always wanted somebody to care about me. And [my mentor], she cared about me. And I liked that (match 42, youth).
>
> Have somebody to come up and visit you. Like at least somebody cares about . . . somebody who's locked up (match 39, youth).

---

[21] For detailed information on the number of participants interviewed, see the Appendix.

[22] Many youth identified more than one person as supportive.

Given the circumstances of these youth's lives, it is not surprising that this rather straightforward characteristic of caring would emerge as primary. What was surprising is another trait cited by youth in characterizing supportive adults in their lives: truthfulness in offering advice. The youth interviewed appear to value peers and adults who, in their words, tell them "straight up," or as one youth put it, "will never eat his words . . . what I mean by that . . . if he got something to say, he'll say it straight up what he got to say" (match 5, youth). Another youth explained: "[My Aunt] don't bullshit around, I mean she just, she come straight with me" (match 15, youth).

Another youth put it this way:

> She'll tell me straight up, you know, what's going on. I mean she'll be like this is what you need to do and you know, you can either do it or you don't have to do it, but this would be best (match 7, youth).

Youth appear to value receiving honest advice even when it comes in the form of constructive criticism, as illustrated by what this youth said about a DCYS staff member:

> She the kind of person that don't only tell you the good what you're doing, but . . . tell you the bad, she wanna help me. She'll tell you up front . . . she ain't gonna tell you what you wanna hear . . . she won't sit there and fill your bucket up with lies . . . I don't know, she just . . . tell you like it is for real (match 41, youth).

The youth also seemed to value friends who were able to "stay out of trouble," and who could help them avoid situations involving illegal or compromising activity--situations that the youth recognized as placing them at risk:

> Sometimes like when I'm upset . . . then I'll go by his house and . . . chill out for a little while . . . and maybe I'll say to him let's walk somewhere or let's go somewhere or let's go to the store or something like that. And sometimes when I'm about to do something [illegal] . . . I'll tell him what's gonna go on and he'll probably just say . . . let's go somewhere else and do something, like go to a store or something, or go to a game room or something. Then I'd rather go with him than to go back down there and start trouble or whatever I have to do (match 20, youth).

When the youth were faced with difficult situations, such as arguments with family members or other youth they encountered, they valued friends who could intervene on their behalf and would come to their aid or "back them up" if they became engaged in a fight. Said one youth:

> On the streets, like I don't know if this is negative or positive . . . if [my friend] see me getting jumped by somebody, he'll help (match 41, youth).

Consistent with other supportive relationships in their lives, youth said they wanted their mentors to give them advice and help them make better decisions. This desire for honest advice and help and, particularly, for someone to tell them what to do, is surprising. It differs markedly from other populations of mentored youth P/PV has studied. Youth participating in college-based mentoring programs or Big Brothers/Big Sisters, for example, also speak of a mentor or Big Brother or Sister as someone to give them advice, but they place greater emphasis on viewing that person as someone with whom they can have fun and go places. While youth in this study talked somewhat about such interests, their desire for an adult to provide concrete advice emerged as a clear priority. For example, consistent with behaviors they value in supportive relationships, youth wanted mentors who would speak "straight up":

> I want a mentor that I can like talk to . . . and . . . tell him things. Then . . . they give you real answers. They'll tell you the truth instead of what I wanna hear. Tell me things that I don't wanna hear so I could try to work on them better. And . . . tell me the truth and be truthful with me (match 37, youth).

Another youth decided to participate in the program based on his friend's experience in the program:

> He had got out and he's . . . saying . . . how the mentor keep him out of trouble. Like . . . if he's having problems . . . or difficulties . . . he can just . . . call his mentor and maybe . . . she'll have a solution for his problems. And I was thinking about . . . his mentor help him . . . get a job and all that . . . just basically . . . being a big brother, big sister, like somebody I never had (match 41, youth).

Understanding the characteristics these youth value in their existing relationships provides a context in which to examine the relationships that developed through the program. Because, not surprisingly, these characteristics of supportive relationships were more likely to be articulated by pair members of sustained relationships developed through the program than by pair members of relationships that failed.

EFFECTIVE PATTERNS OF INTERACTION

The following patterns of interaction were more likely to be found in sustained matches than in discontinued matches: the mentor understood the importance of consistency; the mentor stayed youth-focused in the help provided, particularly in intervening on the youth's behalf and offering advice that the youth appreciated; and the mentor interacted with the youth's family. It is important to note that these effective patterns were not observed in every sustained match. They also appeared in a few discontinued matches, but this was the exception rather than the rule.

Understanding the Importance of Consistency

In sustained matches, adult volunteers were likely to understand the need to be consistent in meeting with the youth. Adult volunteers and youth in 17 of the 20 sustained matches spoke of the adult's understanding of this need, and how the adult demonstrated this understanding simply by showing up for meetings as promised and by keeping in regular contact with the youth. Conversely, only three adults and youth in the 22 discontinued matches spoke of the adult's consistency. This mentor from a sustained match acknowledged the importance of consistency:

> If I tell him that I'm going to do something, I do it. If I say I'm going to be here, I'll be here. He trusts me and he sees me as somebody positive in his life (match 3, mentor).

In sustained matches, the youth appreciated the adults' consistency, with a few stating that the mentoring relationship compensated for their strained or absent relationships with parents:

> I ain't never met my father, and he kind of plays the father role to me, 'cause he's always here for me . . . 'cause . . . if he tells me something and I fail, I know he ain't going to let me down. Like my real father--I expected him to be there, but he was never there. When [my mentor] tells me he's going to be there, he's always there (match 18, youth).

By establishing a consistent presence in their youth's lives, adults in sustained relationships were able to fulfill a critical need voiced by the youth--the need for a caring relationship with an adult.

Staying Youth-Focused

Mentors in the sustained relationships studied here exhibit patterns similar to those found in effective relationships in other mentoring programs P/PV has studied: they follow the youth's interests, allow the youth to disclose whatever they want whenever they feel ready, and consistently reassure the youth of their value.[23] The following quotes illustrate some mentors' ability to accept their youth as individuals and to follow the youth's lead in determining the focus of help:

> You don't go in and say, your life has failed you and I can fix all that . . . if you do what I've done, you will be fine. Then you're finished. I mean, everybody's so different, you have to be so prepared for the fact that if you give advice, you stand a chance of alienating. Make sure that it's solicited,

---

[23] For more discussion of effective and ineffective patterns, see Styles and Morrow (1992) and Tierney and Branch (1992).

> either directly or by some sign, I think, before you start saying that you should do x, y and z. That's worked really well for us. You don't want to drive them away, you want them to look at their time with you as a comforting, strengthening kind of, you know--instead of the lecture starts, set the clock, here it comes . . . The fact that you want to go into it realizing that they're an individual, you're an individual, and there's no correlation there. You don't want to remake them in your image (match 2, mentor).

> They need somebody to talk to. There's so many people talking to them and telling them everything. They need somebody who's going to listen to them. And I'll learn more from them by listening than by telling him what to do. I need to know what he's feeling, what he thinks, what makes him do the things that he does (match 35, mentor).

> When I first went into this, the first thing I told her [is] . . . if I ever say something to you that you don't like, tell me. First of all I'm not trying to be your mother, I want to be your friend. I don't want to make you what I am or what I think you should be. So you tell me what you wanna do and let's work on whatever you wanna do or be . . . And the conversation with [my youth] has been fabulous. You know, she'll just, she talks, she don't hold anything back (match 32, mentor).

Intervening on the Youth's Behalf

Adults in the sustained relationships in this project often played an instrumental role in helping the youth cope with the juvenile justice system and their families. This pattern is supported by follow-up survey data showing that mentors who report intervening on youth's behalf have significantly longer relationships.[24]

In nine of the 20 sustained relationships, compared with only three of the 22 discontinued relationships, adults reported intervening with either a staff member or a parent. The youth said they appreciated it. This youth talked of his mentor's role as advocate:

> Youth: Who, [my mentor], yeah, she bored [my caseworker] to death. I mean . . . she'll talk up, she won't be scared like my mom. My mom be scared, well [my mom will say your caseworker] will probably yell at me or something. [My mentor will say] well why are you doing this and all this . . . [My mentor], she'll talk up.

---

[24] All reported relationships between survey variables and variables of longevity and meeting frequency are measured by correlations exceeding .25.

> Interviewer: Do you like that she does that?
>
> Youth: I wish my mama did (match 4, youth).

The staff interviewed did not always welcome mentors serving as youth advocates, especially when one mentor called the head of the agency to complain about the treatment his youth was receiving. Still, the adults' advocacy was understood and even expected. As the pilot program was being designed, both St. Louis and Atlanta DCYS staff were aware that opening their systems to the public would by definition bring greater scrutiny of their practices. Given the facilities' scarce resources and the needs of the youth, the benefit of mobilizing a cadre of volunteers outweighed the anticipated risks. One adult volunteer described how he approached a staff member to advocate for his youth:

> I said . . . I'm never gonna defend [my youth] and to hold him up on a pedestal, but I expect him to have the same treatment as anybody else in here. You know, is it fair if folks like yourselves choose favorites? And I said it just so happens that . . . [my youth's] got me to look after him, be it good, bad or indifferent, you know, I exist, you know, and I'm gonna let you know. And consequently I told her I want you to let me know when he's screwing up cause he won't always tell me. And she and I got along real well from that point on. She knew where I was coming from, I wasn't gonna take any crap, you know, I wasn't gonna let her push him around. And she also knew that I wasn't gonna just let him--she didn't think I was always gonna be at his defense, you know (match 36, mentor).

Six adults in sustained relationships, compared with none in discontinued relationships, received phone calls in the middle of the night when their youth was in crisis, usually requesting intervention. As one mentor recalled:

> He would call me and say well . . . I got this gun in my hand and my best friend just got shot, or my brother just got shot, you know, I want to go out and retaliate, you know. And he would cry, you know, he would vent out. And just him picking up the phone to call me before he went to do that showed me that it was a cry for help, you know (match 29, mentor).

Another youth called just to hear a friendly voice:

> Well, like whenever I'm down or anything he tells me to call him any time. So whenever I'm usually down, it's like, whenever anybody else is sleeping and I'm the only one up in the house . . . I sit down there and talk to [him], I'll call and wake him up. He goes oh, no, no, no, that's all right. Sometimes you hear a snore, it's funny (match 38, youth).

The follow-up survey data indicate that mentors who felt part of their role was to be "reachable any time of the day or night" were significantly more likely to be in sustained relationships.

Providing Advice that Youth Value

Mentors and youth talked a lot, with 74 percent of 103 mentors who responded to the follow-up survey reporting that their youth confided in them. And although adults in both sustained and discontinued matches provided advice and encouragement, the in-depth interview data indicate that adults in sustained matches were more successful in providing the kind of honest, straightforward advice that the youth requested and appreciated. One adult described her approach:

> If I'm just straightforward with him, then he's gonna tell me. I find that that's about the only way you can work, deal with these kids. You've just got to be straightforward with them and say okay, what's the deal (match 31, mentor).

In 12 of the 20 sustained matches, either the youth or the adult spoke of the youth's appreciation of advice received, compared with only three of the 22 discontinued matches. One youth said:

> And she just be there for me a lot of times when I need like somebody [from the] outside to support me and stuff like that, [someone] not in this program. And she's very respectful . . . to me . . . Like if I'm coming up, straight up to her and like telling her my problem, like she'll be honest and tell me what decision should I make and what decision that'll fit me. And like she help me a lot on my decisions that I make. And a lot of times, she just come straight up with what she gotta tell me. And like she's just respectful, like if she has something to say, she'll say it (match 5, youth).

Added another, "[She'll] tell you straight up and she will never put you down" (match 7, youth).

Survey data support this finding. Mentors in sustained relationships were significantly more likely than mentors in discontinued relationships to define their role as being "ready to talk about anything"; "like a parent"; and "like a teacher."

We also found that along with advice-giving, adults in both sustained and discontinued relationships appeared to lecture the youth, with these admonishments typically focused on telling youth how to avoid returning to the juvenile justice system in the future. One adult in a sustained relationship recounted a recent admonition:

> I told him, I'm so sick and tired of you going to detention. You know? . . . Well I didn't do it . . . I said, I don't care whether you did it or not, you know? We're talking about responsibilities, that's all we're talking about. [He said] well, I tell you, [the police] just don't like me. I said, bull. I did it just like that. I said, bull, don't tell me that, I wasn't born yesterday. Are you conning [me]? [He said] I just know I didn't do it. Okay, so you didn't do it. So where are you going to get the proof? . . . As a matter of fact, I think that might have been the time . . . when he and the boys were together, three boys together, you know, and knocked this old lady in the ditch. I was so angry. I said . . . that's really being cowards. You know what I mean? Hitting a lady? A woman? What you gonna do that for? (match 14, mentor).

The interview data indicate that some of the youth interviewed appeared to value such reprimands. For example, this mentor's youth said the following:

> Interviewer: In what ways [did having a mentor] really help you?
> Youth: Like telling me . . . when I was messing up . . . If she see me doing something wrong, she could tell me (match 14, youth).

Consistent with P/PV's research on other mentoring programs, the interview data here suggest that youth react negatively when lecturing makes up the majority of their interactions with adult volunteers. In fact, in other programs P/PV has studied, when lecturing was the central focus of the relationship--when it remained unbalanced by supportive and caring elements, such as meeting consistently with the youth--youth tended to "vote with their feet" and withdraw from the relationship by not returning phone calls or by being generally unresponsive.

Interacting with the Youth's Family

Finally, adults in sustained relationships were more likely to have contact with the youth's family. Adult volunteers encountered family members during visiting hours at the facilities, during day passes away from the facility, and in the community, both when the youth were released and when the relationship originated there. Adults in sustained relationships felt that family members supported their involvement, and would often turn to family members to help them locate the youth. In a few cases, the adult volunteer served as a resource to the family--e.g., one mentor brought his youth home for a holiday, while another helped organize a party for a family member. And as in other mentoring programs, adults in sustained relationships were careful in negotiating their role with the family. One mentor gave the following account of how she informed her youth's mother that her first priority was the youth:

> When I would go [to my youth's home] her mom wanted my undivided attention. She said Alicia[25] wants you all to herself. I said, well, that was kind of like the deal [laughter], I said, but I don't mind talking to you. I said I'll talk to you any time, I said but let me just work with Alicia for a while. And then she said that's okay, but Alicia needs to quit being so selfish (match 32, mentor).

Again, follow-up survey data support this finding. Of the 72 youth who responded to the survey, youth who reported that their mentor had met their families and youth who reported that their mentors had talked with their families were significantly more likely to be in sustained matches.

There appears to be a delicate balance between authority and nurturing--the youth request intervention, they seek a supportive adult to tell them what they need to do to succeed--in essence, they seek information--but the findings here indicate that the behavior of the person delivering the information is almost as critical as the information itself. Adults in sustained relationships demonstrate to youth that they are, in fact, the caring individuals whom the youth seek. Perhaps the greatest demonstration of their caring is "being there" for the youth--fulfilling the program expectation of meeting with the youth on a consistent basis.

---

[25] Name has been changed.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

P/PV's study of these two pilot mentoring programs was designed to provide more information on the feasibility of integrating mentoring relationships into a large youth-serving institution--the juvenile justice system. Specifically, the project was designed to determine whether 100 adult volunteers in each program (50 over the age of 55) could be recruited, trained and matched with 100 adjudicated youth; whether supervision of these matches could be dispersed to individual caseworkers; and whether these adult volunteers could facilitate both the youth's treatment while incarcerated and their return to their communities on release.

The pilot provided sobering evidence of the difficulty of implementing a mentoring program for high-risk youth within the juvenile justice system. Because such systems are typically constrained by limited budgets, the project design called for the integration of the program into the existing institutional structure with the allocation of few additional resources. However, without funding to employ full-time staff to supervise the matches, the program could not meet its goals.

Significant challenges arose at each point of the program's implementation; the unique demands of the institution and the youth population it serves, compounded with limited resources, often made these issues difficult to address effectively. The following sections highlight the problems and successes each program experienced in implementing the program components, and include our observations about the implications of those problems and successes.

RECRUITMENT

Neither site was successful in reaching the targeted 100 matches; interviews with program staff and participants suggest that the number of youth wanting a mentor was greater than the number of volunteers available to be matched. Thus, as in other mentoring programs, the demand for volunteers outweighed the supply. Clearly, recruiting mentors for this population is both time-consuming and difficult.

The two pilot programs were successful in recruiting black men--a population of volunteers other mentoring programs report limited success in recruiting. This success can be attributed to targeted recruitment strategies employed, and, in Atlanta, to the name recognition of the NAACP, which managed the recruitment effort.

For both programs, the recruitment of elders required different strategies than those used to attract non-elders, as few elders came forward in response to either general recruitment efforts or those targeting black volunteers. P/PV's requirement that each program recruit 100 mentors within a six-month period, coupled with both agencies' questions about the relative merits of choosing elder mentors over non-elders to work with youth, resulted in the agencies' initial focus on recruiting adult mentors of any age. Moreover, the need to process the overwhelming response to initial newspaper stories distracted the agencies from designing strategies specifically to attract elders. Interviews with project directors and elder-serving organizations indicate that elders' fear of young offenders, transportation problems and need for stipends further explain why few elders volunteered.

TRAINING

Although the majority of mentors attended at least one training session, mentors reported that the sessions did not provide the type of specific information they felt they needed to interact effectively with the youth. According to follow-up survey data and in-depth interviews, volunteers wanted more information on the youth's family, and on the rules and regulations of the facility. The lack of concrete information is a common complaint among adult volunteers serving as mentors (Styles and Morrow, 1992; Tierney and Branch, 1992).

MATCHING

Consistent with the matching process of other programs P/PV has examined, the two pilot programs matched youth and mentors based on common interests and on the youth's particular needs (e.g., absence of a strong male or female role model). Due to the complexities and structure of the juvenile justice system, however, the matching process proved to be time-consuming and complicated--particularly in Atlanta, where numerous agency staff were given possible mentor candidates to contact. In both programs, caseworkers familiar with the youth played a central role in matching volunteers. However, the demands of caseworkers' existing workloads slowed the matching process to the extent that some volunteers were never matched.

The sites, particularly St. Louis, demonstrated a willingness to make matches in which the race and gender of mentors and youth were different. Allowing cross-gender and cross-race matches yielded greater flexibility in matching and allowed more youth to be matched. We found no differences between same- and cross-race matches, nor between same- and cross-gender matches. Qualities of consistency, demonstrated support and caring were found to be more important than shared gender or race.

SUPERVISION

Decentralization of supervision to existing staff, stipulated by the model, proved untenable. Interviews with staff and mentors indicate that the responsibility for supervision cannot be grafted onto existing staff job descriptions. Not only did staff's workloads preclude consistent attention to mentors' needs, staff felt they had no authority over the mentors and thus were reluctant to contact those who failed to show up. The large number of matches that failed to meet consistently or last longer than six months attests to the problems inherent in this supervisory structure.

This study confirms what P/PV has learned in studying other mentoring programs: programs with regular, dedicated supervision produce matches with the highest frequency of meetings, while those that fail to institute systematic supervision or reduce supervision under budget pressure have low rates of interaction. Specifically, the findings documented here indicate that good intentions on the part of volunteers are not sufficient. Given the competing demands on their time, adult volunteers require a program that consistently provides both reminders and encouragement.

Supervision became an even bigger concern once youth were released from the facilities; the lack of an aftercare system meant that any structure provided by the institution disappeared. Absent a base to which the mentoring program could be tied, relationships that met regularly inside the facilities floundered and ended once the youth were released.

At both sites, mentors were given little guidance in designing activities to engage their youth, while the constraints on their actions were great. Opportunities to go off campus were limited, as were available opportunities for recreation. Even conversational interactions were sometimes constrained, as some St. Louis facilities required other youth to be present during conversations between the mentoring pair. These constraints increased the difficulty of building a relationship between the mentor and youth.

CHALLENGES OF THE SYSTEM

The program issues raised by this study can, of course, be addressed in ways that would likely result in more effective approaches. However, challenges posed by the youth themselves and the juvenile justice system itself merit further discussion. The pilot project targeted a population of youth recognized by practitioners as very difficult to serve. The needs of the youth are great, as evidenced by the adversity of their life circumstances. Adult volunteers found these youth to be transient, difficult to contact and, in some cases, involved in frequent confrontations with the law. The commitment and maturity required of successful mentors in this context probably limits the potential pool of effective mentors significantly.

In addition, the juvenile justice system is very complex, tightly structured and largely insular. It is designed to secure youth, and has traditionally not opened its doors to the public and the intervention of volunteers. Although we found that the directors of the two participating agencies were open to new and innovative programming, implementing this program within these institutions, and gaining the support and assistance of the overtaxed line staff, proved extremely difficult.

In short, the juvenile justice system is a very difficult institution in which to integrate mentoring on a large scale. Without significant change within the system--including the allocation of additional staff resources, flexibility in working with volunteers and an aftercare system to provide other needed services--mentoring programs are unlikely to be integrated effectively.

However, youth in our study truly seemed to appreciate mentors' efforts, and in some cases, adjudicated youth and mentors did form meaningful relationships, meeting a great and obvious need in these young people's lives. While youth were incarcerated, mentors offered welcome opportunities to escape temporarily the tedium of institutional life. For some youth, the mentor was the only person who visited on a regular basis. Because the need for supportive adults in the lives of these youth is so evident, we believe that there is a place for adult volunteers in the juvenile justice system--and this perspective is shared by the Georgia and Missouri systems, both of whom plan to continue operating mentoring programs for their youth. However, the effective integration of adult volunteers cannot be accomplished cheaply.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A mentoring program may be feasible, but only if systems can devote significant staff resources to recruiting, screening, training and supervising the mentors, and to facilitating their interactions with the young people. It is important to stress that a mentoring program will require both change in institutional practices and additional costs. Where systems are willing to devote such resources to a mentoring program, we make the following specific recommendations to enhance the probability of their success:

1. Increase the number of volunteers gradually. Given the complexities of the juvenile justice system, we recommend that systems take a gradual approach to implementing the program, introducing a few volunteers at a time and being careful not to overburden staff.

2. Screen out adults who have overcommitted their time. In both sites, mentors who were too busy to meet with youth consistently posed problems. If matches are not meeting, the potential damage to youth as they are abandoned by yet another adult may be greater than any benefits offered. P/PV's requirement that the two sites go to scale within the first six months of the demonstration may have contributed to this problem. It is important that screening be rigorous, so that only adults capable of meeting a weekly commitment be assigned as mentors.

3. Increase the length, content and practicality of mentor training. Training should focus on concrete information about the youth and the institution, including the rules, staff roles, the youth's treatment plan, and appropriate expectations for the relationship (e.g., how much change the adult can expect to see in the youth). State confidentiality requirements may limit the amount of information from youth's records that can be

released; however, where confidentiality is not compromised, information should be shared freely with mentors. Issues of commitment to the program and the responsibility of the adult in the relationship to contact the youth should be emphasized.

4. Provide supervision and support to volunteers. The job of coordinating the program should not be forced on staff who have little time or are ambivalent about the program. The program should appoint one or more coordinators of volunteers, whose primary responsibility is the mentoring program.

5. Adjust institutional rules. Where security will not be jeopardized, flexibility should be encouraged so that pairs can have greater privacy in interpersonal communications, more options for recreational activities and more latitude in selecting visiting times and days.

6. Establish aftercare systems within which the mentoring program can be continued after the youth's release from the institution. In the absence of aftercare, relationships are unlikely to continue meeting in the community. With mentoring as part of an aftercare program that involves regular contact with a caseworker and such services as family and individual counseling, vocational training, GED classes and recreational activities, relationships will continue to have a programmatic base for meeting and may last longer.

While youth need caring, supportive adults in their lives, mentoring alone cannot compensate for comprehensive programming delivered by trained professionals. If adjudicated youth are to become responsible, productive, law-abiding adults, they need comprehensive services--not just inside the facility, but upon their release and return to the community.

REFERENCES

Berndt, Thomas J., and Kristelle E. Miller
1990 "Expectancies, Values, and Achievement in Junior High School." Journal of Educational Psychology, 82: 319-326.

Bird, Gloria W., and Rhonda L. Harris
1990 "A Comparison of Role Strain and Coping Strategies by Gender and Family Structure Among Early Adolescents." Journal of Early Adolescence, 10:141-158.

Bretherton, Inger
1985 "Attachment Theory: Retrospect and Prospect," in I. Bretherton and E. Walker (eds.). Growing Points of Attachment Theory and Research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50:1-2, No. 209.

Center for Intergenerational Learning
1991 "The Challenge of Collaboration," in LinkLetter, the newsletter of Linking Lifetimes. Philadelphia: Temple University Institute on Aging.

Champion, Dean J.
1992 The Juvenile Justice System: Delinquency, Processing and the Law. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Cowen, Emory L., and William C. Work
1988 "Resilient Children, Psychological Wellness and Primary Prevention." American Journal of Community Psychology, 16(4): 591-607.

Dryfoos, Joy G.
1990 Adolescents At Risk: Prevalence and Prevention. New York: Oxford University Press.

Duncan, Greg J., and Willard Rodgers
1988 "Longitudinal Aspects of Childhood Poverty." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50:1007-1021.

Elliot, Delbert, and Suzanne S. Ageton
1980 "Reconciling Race and Class Differences in Self-Reported and Official Estimates of Delinquency." American Sociological Review, 45: 95-110.

Freedman, Marc
1988 Partners in Growth: Elder Mentors and At-Risk Youth. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Freedman, Marc
1992 The Kindness of Strangers: Reflections on the Mentoring Movement. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Freedman, Marc, Anne C. Harvey, and Catherine Ventura-Merkle
1992 The Quiet Revolution: Elder Service and Youth Development in an Aging Society. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.

Furano, Kathryn, Phoebe Roaf, Melanie Styles, and Alvia Branch
1993 Big Brothers/Big Sisters: A Study of Program Practices. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Furstenberg, Frank
1993 "How Families Manage Risk and Opportunity in Dangerous Neighborhoods," in William Julius Wilson (ed.). Sociology and the Public Agenda. New York: Sage.

Garbarino, James, and Deborah Sherman
1980 "High-Risk Neighborhoods and High-Risk Families: The Human Ecology of Child Maltreatment." Child Development, 51:188-198.

Gottlieb, Benjamin H.
1988 "Marshalling Social Support: The State of the Art in Research and Practice," in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.). Marshalling Social Support. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Greim, Jeffrey L.
1992 Adult/Youth Relationships Pilot Project: Initial Implementation Report. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Harter, Susan
1988 Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents. Denver, Colorado: University of Denver.

Jenks, Christopher, and Susan Mayer
1990 "The Social Consequences of Growing Up in a Poor Neighborhood: A Review," in M. McGeary and L. Lynn (eds.). Inner-City Poverty in the United States. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Land, Kenneth C., Patricia L. McCall, and Lawrence E. Cohen
1990 "Structural Co-Variants of Homicide Rates: Are There Any Invariances Across Time and Space?" American Journal of Sociology, 95:922-963.

Lodestar Management/Research Inc.
1989 Linking Lifetimes Mentor Intake Interview. Los Angeles: Lodestar Management/Research, Inc.

McLoyd, Vonnie
1990 "The Impact of Economic Hardship on Black Families and Children: Psychological Distress, Parenting and Socioemotional Development." Child Development, 61:311-346.

Moos, Rudolf H., Ruth C. Cronkite, and John W. Finney
1990 Health and Daily Living Form Manual, Second Edition. Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Medical Center.

National Research Council Panel on High-Risk Youth
1993 Losing Generations: Adolescents in High-Risk Settings. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Neemann, Jennifer, and Susan Harter
1986 Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for College Students. Denver, Colorado: University of Denver.

Nowicki, Stephen Jr., and Bonnie R. Strickland
1973 "A Locus of Control Scale for Children." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40:148-154.

Resnick, Gary, Martha R. Burt, Lisa Newark, and Lorraine Reilly
1992 Youth At Risk: Definitions, Prevalence and Approaches to Service Delivery. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Rutter, Michael
1987 "Psychosocial Resilience and Protective Mechanisms." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57:316-331.

Sandler, Irwin, Paul Miller, Jerome Short, and Sharlene Wolchik
1989 "Social Support as a Protective Factor for Children in Stress," in Deborah Belle (ed.). Children's Social Networks and Social Support. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Simonsen, Clifford E.
1991 Juvenile Justice in America. New York: MacMillan.

Snyder, James, and Gerald R. Patterson
1987 "Family Interaction and Delinquent Behavior," in Herbert C. Quay (ed.). Handbook of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Wiley.

Styles, Melanie B., and Kristine V. Morrow
1992 Understanding How Youth and Elders Form Relationships: A Study of Four Linking Lifetimes Programs. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Tierney, Joseph P., and Alvia Y. Branch
1992 College Students as Mentors for At-Risk Youth: A Study of Six Campus Partners in Learning Programs. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Vaux, Alan, and Mary Ruggiero
1983 "Stressful Life Change and Delinquent Behavior." American Journal of Community Psychology, 11:169-183.

Werner, Emmy, and Ruth Smith
1982 Vulnerable But Invincible: A Longitudinal Study of Resilient Children and Youth. New York: McGraw Hill.

Wilson, William J.
1987 The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX

METHODOLOGY

P/PV designed the Adult/Youth Relationships Pilot Project to test whether mentoring could be integrated at scale into a large youth-serving institution and to examine the patterns of relationships that form between mentors and adjudicated youth. In addition, we sought to pilot measures of the possible benefits accruing to youth and elder mentors from participation.

DATA SOURCES

Data were collected from a variety of sources: interviews with staff at each site at three points in time; baseline and follow-up questionnaires administered to youth and mentors; in-depth interviews with mentors and youth; weekly logs completed by mentors; mentor applications and screening interviews; agency records; and project site records. Once collected, data were merged and used to inform the analyses.

Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Baseline and follow-up questionnaires were administered to youth and mentors prior to and following their involvement in the mentoring program. Data on demographics, length of match, frequency of meeting, reasons for termination, mentor and youth perceptions of the program and the match, and social psychological measures were gathered from these questionnaires.

Youth

Youth were administered a baseline questionnaire by on-site research assistants in Atlanta and St. Louis. To address the dual concerns of literacy and privacy, the research assistant read the questionnaire while the youth followed along and marked answers on his or her own copy. Where several youth at a particular location were being matched at the same time, the questionnaire was administered in small groups; in other cases, the administration was individual. The baseline questionnaire was completed by 158 youth (98%). In three cases, youth were released from the institution before the baseline was completed and subsequent attempts to locate them were unsuccessful.

The research design called for youth to be followed up one year after their match had been made, regardless of whether the match terminated before the end of one year; this would allow sufficient time to pass for the measurement of attitudinal change. Because recruitment took longer than expected, not all matches were made by the initial target date of April 1992; thus, the follow-up period had to be shortened for some matches.

Twenty percent of the youth received the follow-up questionnaire less than 12 months after they were matched. However, no follow-up period was shorter than nine months.

The survey was administered over the telephone. Youth were sent a letter that informed them of the survey and asked them to call a toll-free number to participate. Telephone interviewers also called youth. When youth were released from facilities and when matches terminated, caseworkers responsible for monitoring the match were asked to complete information forms giving three contact names and phone numbers for each youth. We received contact information for all but six youth. In many cases, the contact numbers yielded no further information on the youth. Where given phone numbers were invalid, individual caseworkers were contacted by telephone to obtain valid phone numbers. However, the lack of an aftercare system meant that many caseworkers were no longer in contact with the youth and could not provide new information. Youth's mentors and Directory Assistance were also consulted in our attempts to get valid phone numbers for youth. In total, follow-up interviews were completed with 72 youth, 45 percent of the sample.

The most pervasive problem encountered (accounting for 34% of the nonrespondents) was difficulty with the given telephone numbers. This included numbers that produced no answer, wrong numbers, and numbers that had been disconnected or changed to unpublished numbers. Thirteen percent of nonrespondents had no telephone in their home. In many of these cases, we were able to contact neighbors or relatives at work who said they would pass on our message to the youth. An on-site research assistant was hired in Atlanta to go to the homes of youth for whom we had addresses but no phone numbers. However, he was never successful in reaching anyone at home, and the youth did not respond to his notes asking them to call us.

For several youth (11%), the information we were able to secure from parents, guardians and caseworkers, was simply "whereabouts unknown." Seven nonresponding youth (8%) lived with their parents, but could not be reached when we called, despite being called upwards of 20 times at different times of the day and evening, and on weekends. In another nine cases (10%), the youth did not live at the number of the contact person (typically a parent, girlfriend, grandmother or other relative) but did stop by sporadically; these youth had no permanent address with a phone and multiple attempts to reach them at the contact number were unsuccessful. Four youth (4%) were incarcerated in adult jails and could not be reached, and an additional two were incarcerated in secure youth detention facilities. Two youth were in Job Corps and told us their restricted schedule precluded interviews. We had beeper numbers for another two youth, but they did not return our calls. One youth was hospitalized for depression, another had run away, and another was out of the country. Two youth refused to complete the interview.[1] Although youth were told they would receive a $15 money order for participating in the follow-up survey, this was apparently not sufficient incentive to attract persistent nonrespondents.

---

[1] One youth gave no reason for refusing. Another refused because she said that she never had a mentor. (The mentor noted on her survey that she and the youth met only a few times before the youth ran away.)

Mentors

Each mentor was asked to complete a baseline questionnaire on entering the program. These questionnaires were administered to mentors at orientation or training sessions. Of the 150 mentors matched, 138 completed baseline questionnaires (92%). Only three mentors in St. Louis and nine in Atlanta did not complete the baseline questionnaires.

One year after the first matches occurred, mentor follow-up surveys were mailed to all mentors whose matches had terminated during the previous year. Mentors whose matches had not yet ended were sent a questionnaire once they had been matched one year or when their relationships were officially terminated by the site. Again, due to slow recruitment, some mentors with ongoing matches completed questionnaires before having been matched one year. (All matches had been made at least nine months prior, however.) Ongoing matches made after June 1992 were sent a questionnaire in June 1993. Mentors who did not return their questionnaires within one month were sent a reminder card and received a reminder phone call from research assistants working on site. In July, a second questionnaire was mailed to all nonrespondents and followed up with a telephone call. (Many mentors had moved during the year or changed their number, creating a problem with invalid phone numbers.) In a final attempt to reach persistent nonrespondents, mentors were contacted by telephone and asked to complete the survey over the phone. Few mentors were willing to complete the entire survey over the phone, but 22 (16%) did agree to a shorter version of the survey that focused on key questions about the match. Once contacted by phone, most mentors said they would mail in the survey, but many failed to do so. Three mentors openly refused to complete the survey.[2] The total number of follow-up questionnaires completed was 103 (69% of the sample).

Mentor Logs

Mentors were asked to complete brief weekly logs to document meetings and activities. The log form was a checklist designed to be filled out in less than five minutes and to provide information useful for both programmatic and research purposes. (For example, the logs had a space where the mentor could note any issues she or he wanted to discuss with the caseworker.) Few mentors turned in logs every week without fail. Consequently, logs are available for 73 percent of the weeks that mentors were matched. Excluding nine mentors who completed no logs, log data were available for 75 percent of the weeks. Collection of the logs proved logistically difficult. Although caseworkers or mentor coordinators were generally responsible for collecting the logs from mentors, mentors sometimes sent the logs directly to the NAACP office in Atlanta or to the main office in St. Louis. In cases where caseworkers (particularly aftercare workers) and mentors rarely met, collection of the logs was particularly problematic.

---

[2] One mentor said she was too busy, another said the questions were too personal, and the third refused due to ill feeling toward the program.

Agency/Program Records

Data on the youth's offense history, age at first referral or adjudication, family status and recommitment were gathered from computerized agency records. This information was available for 96 percent of the youth.

Program records provided information on starting and ending dates for matches as well as recruitment data, including length of time for matching and referral sources.

Mentors at each site completed a preliminary application or interview. In St. Louis, mentors filled out the application, which asked questions about their motivation to be a mentor, previous volunteer experiences and other background variables. In Atlanta, a questionnaire collecting similar information came from a standard interview completed by a staff person. Atlanta was able to supply copies of the interview for 86 percent of the mentors. In St. Louis, staff members who volunteered as mentors were exempt from completing applications and staff could not locate a number of mentor applications. The total number of applications available from St. Louis was 45 (65%). Due to the large amount of missing data from this source, data from initial applications were used only to fill in variables of race, occupation and recruitment source where this information was missing and to look at mentors' previous volunteer experience.

Interviews with Participants

To understand why some relationships in the two programs were successful in meeting regularly while others failed, face-to-face semistructured interviews were conducted separately with youth and adults representing 42 pairs--20 pairs from Atlanta and 22 pairs from St. Louis. These pairs were selected to represent a cross-section of matches that originated in community and facility settings, and involved ongoing relationships and relationships that terminated prematurely.

At each site, interviews were conducted during a four-day span when three P/PV interviewers were on site in Atlanta in December 1992 and in St. Louis in February 1993. All interviews were scheduled by P/PV research assistants on site and recorded on tape; the adult volunteer interviews lasted an average of 1.5 hours and the youth interviews lasted about 45 minutes.

Research assistants at both sites encountered problems in scheduling the interviews, since both pair members were not always available to be interviewed. Both pair members were interviewed in 19 matches; in cases where only one pair member was available to be interviewed, that pair member represented the match. Thus, six youth and 17 adult volunteers were interviewed to represent 23 matches. All but two of the matches interviewed were of the same race, with the majority being black (31 black pairs, nine white pairs, one black mentor matched with a white youth, and one Hispanic mentor matched with a white youth). Ten of the pairs were all female, 20 were all male, and 12 matched a female mentor with a male youth.

The majority of the matches (30 pairs) originated in Atlanta and St. Louis detention facilities; the remaining 12 originated in the Atlanta community treatment centers. Of the 42 matches interviewed, 20 lasted seven months or longer and had met on average at least twice a month for two months. These matches, referred to as "sustained," met more regularly and lasted longer than the majority of the 163 matches in the two programs. The other 22 interviewed matches were "discontinued" matches that met sporadically or lasted less than seven months. The interview transcripts were content-analyzed, and sustained relationships were compared with discontinued relationships to determine whether any differences in the pair members' styles of interaction could be detected.

Site Visits: Observation and Interviews

Both sites were visited three times by two P/PV researchers. During these visits, P/PV staff interviewed agency staff, conducted focus groups with mentors, youth and elder-serving organizations, and observed training sessions. The first visit, in January 1992, focused on describing the institutional context for the mentoring program--the progression of youth through the system, the institutional environments themselves and staff responsibilities both in their job and with the mentoring program. The second and third site visits, conducted in Spring 1992 and Winter 1992/93, focused on the institution's ability to integrate mentoring into the existing program structure and maintain relationships once the youth returned to the community. Staff at all levels were interviewed at each facility, at the CTCs and the community school in Atlanta and at District Offices. We conducted 130 interviews with 76 different staff members. (Some interviews were conducted in group settings, but the majority were individual.) Some were interviewed once, while others were interviewed two or three times as the implementation of the program proceeded. Focus groups were conducted with youth and mentor participants about the program's implementation. In addition, focus groups and individual interviews were conducted with matched elders and representatives of elder-serving organizations to address the issues of elder recruitment.

LENGTH OF MATCH AND FREQUENCY OF MEETING

Length of match was calculated from program records and mentor follow-up surveys. Where discrepancies arose, we consulted mentor logs and youth surveys to confirm information on the length of the match. We categorized frequency of meeting from the weekly logs completed by mentors. Excluding the nine mentors who turned in no logs, we have weekly mentor log data for 75 percent of the weeks that mentors and youth were matched. Where log data were missing, we estimated the frequency of meeting by the apparent trend of the available logs. When too many logs were missing to decipher a pattern of meeting, we consulted reported frequency in mentor and youth surveys, and, where available, mentor interviews. In six cases, log data were unavailable and other sources of data were deemed inadequate to determine frequency of meeting.

TESTING YOUTH OUTCOME MEASURES

Because this program was a pilot with a small number of participants and the possibility of successful implementation of the program had yet to be evaluated, we decided against conducting an impact study using a control or comparison group that would measure changes in the youth's lives that could be directly attributed to the intervention. Rather, we used this pilot to, first, evaluate the feasibility of implementation of the program and, second, to test and refine outcome measures that might be useful for a larger demonstration. The outcomes study was thus designed to pilot measures of attitudinal and behavioral change in the lives of adjudicated youth.

Methodology

Youth were administered a questionnaire at baseline and a second questionnaire one year later to measure changes on several dimensions: feelings of self-worth, locus of control, coping strategies, attitudes toward school, engagement in antisocial activities, and use of drugs and alcohol.

Feelings of self-worth were measured by Harter's *Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents* (1988). This scale taps the extent to which adolescents like themselves and are happy with the way they are leading their lives. Nowicki and Strickland's *Internal/External Control Scale for Children* (1973) measures the extent to which youth feel they are responsible for outcomes in their lives. Changes in coping strategies used by youth were measured by three subscales of Bird and Harris' *Adolescent Coping Scale* (1990): family support (talking with family members), ventilation (acting out), and self-reliance (drawing on internal psychological resources).[3] Berndt and Miller's *School Value Scale* (1990) measured the value youth placed on education and doing well in school.

Engagement in antisocial activities was measured by two scales: the behavioral conduct subscale of Harter's *Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents*, which taps the degree to which youth like the way they behave and avoid getting into trouble, and a delinquency scale consisting of 15 delinquency items from the *National Youth Survey* (reported in Elliott and Ageton, 1980). The delinquency items asked the youth for the frequency with which they were involved in behaviors ranging from cheating in school to selling drugs to assault.[4] Use of drugs and alcohol were assessed by single items.[5]

---

[3] A fourth subscale, diversion (keeping one's mind off the problem), was initially included, but was later dropped from analysis due to an unacceptably low Cronbach's alpha at baseline.

The low response rate on the follow-up questionnaire (45%) makes generalization of the results particularly difficult. Youth who participated in the follow-up may have different characteristics and may have had different experiences in the mentoring program than youth whom we could not locate. The utility of the outcomes analysis lies in the examination of results as indicators of potentially fruitful areas of study in other investigations, rather than as an assessment of effectiveness. Moreover, the lack of a control group precludes causal statements.

Analytic Strategy

For our analysis of outcome measures, only youth with both a baseline and a follow-up survey were included--a total of 71 respondents. To include the maximum number of cases, item means were substituted for missing values in calculating scale scores. Where respondents skipped entire scales, the score for that respondent was recorded as missing. Variables that were answered by a single item were analyzed for the sample with valid responses.

Reliability (internal consistency) tests were performed on all scales at baseline and follow-up and all scales had a Cronbach's alpha at or above the level of .60. (See Table A-1.)

Results

For each scale, we determined the difference between the follow-up score and the baseline score. Although the youth who participated in this study are not a sample drawn from a population, we conducted significance tests (t-tests) to give an indication of the magnitude of change that could be detected with these measures, given the small number of subjects.

As Table A-2 indicates, youth's feelings of self-worth changed in a positive direction and youth experienced a more internal locus of control. (A lower score indicates a more internal locus of control; a higher score indicates a more external locus of control.) This means they felt more in control over events in their lives. Youth's coping strategies reflected a greater utilization of self-reliance and family support. Use of venting as a coping strategy changed little.

---

[4] A 16th item measuring sexual assault was originally included in the scale, but was dropped due to low frequency of responses and the gender-specific nature of the item.

[5] Due to the small number of youth who ever used drugs other than alcohol and marijuana, only alcohol and marijuana use were retained in the analysis.

TABLE A-1

CRONBACH'S ALPHA FOR YOUTH SCALES

SCALE	BASELINE	FOLLOW-UP
Global self-worth	.79	.71
Behavioral conduct	.66	.60
School value	.84	.80
Locus of control	.67	.80
Delinquency	.89	.90
Coping Subscales		
Self-reliance	.71	.70
Venting	.72	.61
Family support	.68	.66

NOTE: Since some youth skipped some scales, sample sizes for individual scales ranged from 68 to 71.

TABLE A-2

YOUTH BASELINE SCORES AND CHANGE AT FOLLOW-UP

SCALE	BASELINE	CHANGE FROM BASELINE	*N*[a]
Global self-worth	2.80	.24*	71
Behavioral conduct	2.27	.21*	70
Locus of control	7.52	-1.14*	70
Delinquency	2.53	-.65***	68
School value	2.87	.01	69
Marijuana use	1.51	-.41*	70
Alcohol use	2.21	-.80***	71
Coping Strategies			
Self-reliance	2.70	.54***	67
Venting	2.45	-.10	67
Family support	2.25	.29*	67

NOTE: All scales, with the exception of locus of control, have scores that can range from 1 to 4. Scores on locus of control can range from 0 to 21.

[a] Some youth did not complete all scales.

* Indicates that the change is statistically different from zero at the .05 level of significance.

*** Indicates that the change is statistically different from zero at the .001 level of significance.

Overall, youth rated their behavior more positively, and indicated a decreased frequency of engagement in delinquent behaviors as well as decreased use of alcohol and marijuana. Youth experienced no change in their feelings toward school.

These findings suggest that these youth experienced some positive change over the course of the demonstration. However, the limitations of the study design preclude inferences about the cause of this change. Youth may have experienced positive change as a result of treatment provided by the system, as a result of natural maturation, or due to some other unmeasured factor. The mentoring intervention was differentially received by the youth in the program, with only 22 of the 71 youth participating in the follow-up involved in matches lasting more than six months and meeting regularly for at least part of that period. We found few differences between youth who received the full intervention and those who did not. However, the lack of random assignment to differing levels of the intervention precludes causal statements concerning the effectiveness of the intervention. For example, youth who were less needy may have dropped out of the program earlier, and the intervention may have improved outcomes for the needier youth who stayed in.

The results do suggest that the outcome measures tested have utility in measuring change in adjudicated youth and, with the employment of a true experimental design (random assignment to treatment and control conditions), and a well-implemented program in which the majority of youth receive the full intervention, causal statements about the effects of mentoring on adjudicated youth may be possible using these measures.

MENTOR OUTCOME MEASURES

Outcomes for mentors were also included in the original design, as P/PV was specifically interested in any benefits of mentoring to elders. We hypothesized that involvement in mentoring might lead to an enhanced feeling of self-worth and, due to increased interactions with other mentors, enhanced feelings of social acceptance and an increase in the mentor's social network. In addition, we felt that elderly mentors in particular might experience physical and mental health benefits brought about by the increased activity level. Finally, we postulated that the help mentors gave to youth would lead to greater life satisfaction.

As the project design called for half of the mentors to be elders, mentor outcomes were purposely selected with the elder population in mind. Due to the lack of elders in the study, scales measuring changes we expected to find only in elders--measures of physical and mental health--were deleted from the follow-up. We used Neemann and Harter's *Self Perception Profile for College Students* (1986) to measure mentor's feelings of global self-worth and social acceptance, and their close friendships.[6] Mentors' social networks were measured by the Social Activities with Friends subscale of Moos, Cronkite, and Finney's *Health and Daily Living Manual* (1990). Mentors' Life Satisfaction was measured by a five-point life satisfaction scale developed by Lodestar Management/Research. These scales were repeated in the follow-up questionnaire. No significant change was found for any mentor items. As the appropriateness of the measures to non-elders is certainly questionable (and different outcome measures would have been selected had the focus not been on elders), the lack of findings comes as little surprise and leaves the question of mentor benefits unanswered.

---

[6] Although Messer and Harter have also developed a Self-Perception Profile that is targeted specifically toward adults, the subscales in the Self-Perception Profile for College Students measured constructs we thought were more likely to be affected by involvement in a mentoring relationship.